Foreign
Broadcast
Information
Service
50
ANNIVERSARY
1941 - 1991

Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-91-043
Tuesday
5 March 1991

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-91-043 CONTENTS *5 March 1991*

NOTICE TO READERS: An * indicates material not disseminated in electronic form.

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

Bessmertnykh, U.S. Envoy Discuss War Aftermath *[TASS]* ... 1
Bessmertnykh, Canadian Envoy Discuss Ties *[TASS]* ... 1
Arctic Cooperation Conference With Canada Opens *[TASS]* ... 1
    Yanayev Receives Delegates *[TASS]* ... 1
First ASTEC Agroindustrial Meeting Held *[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 15 Feb]* ... 1

China

Ivashko Continues Official Visit to PRC ... 1
    Tours Shanghai Car Factory *[TASS]* ... 1
    Talks With Shanghai Mayor Zhu Rongji *[TASS]* ... 2
    PRC Spokesman on Ivashko Talks *[Moscow International]* ... 2
    Chinese Reportage on Ivashko Visit ... 2
    Ivashko Comments on Visit *[TASS]* ... 3
Ivashko Sees 'Much of Value' in China *[PRAVDA 5 Mar]* ... 3
Improving Ties Prove 'Bitter Lessons' Learned *[Moscow International]* ... 4

Northeast Asia

Delegation Attends Mongolian Party Congress ... 5
    Malofeyev-led Delegation Arrives *[Moscow Radio]* ... 5
    Party Congress Opens *[TASS]* ... 5
    MPRP Leader Receives Delegations *[TASS]* ... 5
    CPSU, CPC Greetings Read at Congress *[TASS]* ... 5
    CPSU Greetings on 70th Anniversary *[PRAVDA 1 Mar]* ... 6
    Congress Debate Examines 'Renewal' *[PRAVDA 27 Feb]* ... 6
Need for North-South Korea Compromises Viewed *[Moscow International]* ... 7
USSR, South Korea Sign Trade Accord in Moscow *[Moscow International]* ... 7
Japanese Ambassador Edamura Meets Officials ... 7
    Meets Polozkov *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 21 Feb]* ... 7
    Meets Dzasokhov *[TASS]* ... 8
    Meets Deputy Foreign Minister *[TASS]* ... 8
Frolov Confers With Businessmen in Japan *[PRAVDA 1 Mar]* ... 8
Soviet-Japanese Fishery Talks Open in Moscow *[Moscow International]* ... 9

Near East & South Asia

TASS Reports Saddam Call on Iraqis To Resist ... 10
Gorbachev Aide Hopes for Saddam Ouster *[AFP]* ... 10
All Forces Urged To Find 'Political Solution' *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 2 Mar]* ... 10
Soviet Muslims Said To Demand Saddam Trial
  [London SAWT AL-KUWAYT AL-DUWALI 28 Feb] ... 10
Kuwaiti Rebuilding Plans, Major Tasks Reported *[IZVESTIYA 2 Mar]* ... 11
Israeli Knesset Member Saguy Interviewed *[IZVESTIYA 2 Mar]* ... 11
Afghanistan's Najibullah on Relations, Trade *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 28 Feb]* ... 13
Israeli Consul General on Soviet Ties, Mideast *[Moscow International]* ... 14

Sub-Saharan Africa

Conjecture on South Africa Contacts Criticized *[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA 2 Mar]* 15
Report on New Front in Ethiopian Fighting Viewed *[Moscow International]* 15
Latest Developments in South Africa Viewed *[IZVESTIYA 27 Feb]* 16

East Europe

Last Soviet Missiles Leave Hungary *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 2 Mar]* 17
Yazov Greets Bulgarian Counterpart on Holiday *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 2 Mar]* 17

West Europe

Treaty Outlining Ties With Germany Detailed *[TASS]* 17
    Comments on German Compensation *[Moscow TV]* 18
Moiseyev Cited on Troop Withdrawal From Germany *[TASS]* 18
General Scores German Stance on Army Deserters *[TASS]* 19
Falin Meets With German PDS Board Members *[PRAVDA 27 Feb]* 19
UK Prime Minister's Moscow Agenda Outlined *[IZVESTIYA 5 Mar]* 19
UK's Major Cited on Bilateral Ties, Gulf War *[IZVESTIYA 1 Mar]* 20
French National Assembly Delegation Pays Visit 21
    Meets With Minister Bessmertnykh *[TASS]* 21
    French Relations Deemed 'Model' *[TASS]* 21
    Received by Lukyanov *[TASS]* 21
Prokofyev Receives Turkish Party Delegation *[PRAVDA 26 Feb]* 22

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Supreme Soviet

Supreme Soviet Ratifies Germany Treaties 4 Mar *[Moscow TV]* 23
    3 of 5 Treaties Ratified *[TASS]* 23
    Kvitsinskiy Outlines Treaties *[Moscow Radio]* 23
    'Historic Importance' Noted *[TASS]* 24
    Dzasokhov Views Treaties *[Moscow TV]* 24
Deputies, Pavlov Disagree on Cabinet Confirmation *[IZVESTIYA 1 Mar]* 26
Defense Complex Management System Retention Urged *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 2 Mar]* 26
People's Deputy From Krasnodar Kray Registered *[IZVESTIYA 28 Feb]* 27

Political & Social

Cabinet of Ministers Session Held *[PRAVDA 5 Mar]* 27
    Gorbachev Views Cabinet Meeting *[Moscow TV]* 28
    Appeal Issued for Scrap Metal *[Moscow TV]* 29
Union Treaty Talks Reach 'Critical Point' *[PRAVDA 28 Feb]* 29
    Second Round of Talks End *[TASS]* 30
    Differences Remain *[IZVESTIYA 5 Mar]* 30
    Treaty Provisions Analyzed *[PRAVDA 5 Mar]* 31
Public Polled on Referendum Voting Intentions *[PRAVDA 2 Mar]* 32
Dzasokhov Addresses University Communists *[PRAVDA 2 Mar]* 32
Ivashko on Referendum, Other Topics *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 28 Feb]* 33
Kryuchkov Interviewed on Current Issues *[TASS]* 37
Plane Set Ablaze After Hijack Thwarted *[TASS]* 37
All-Union Conference on Crisis Situation Opens *[TASS]* 37
Significance of Gorbachev Minsk Speech Weighed *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 28 Feb]* 38

Economic

TU Requests No Unprotected Firings *[TRUD 1 Mar]* 38
Soviet Miners Strike in Kuzbass Region *[AFP]* 39
27 Mines in Kuznetsk Basin Strike 4 Mar *[Radio Rossii]* 39

Limited Support For Strike Among Kuzbass Miners *[Moscow TV]* 39
Miners at Pit in Donbass Decide To Strike *[Moscow Radio]* 40
'Most' Mines Resume Normal Operations *[TASS]* 40
Miners From 12 Donbass Facilities Go On Strike *[TASS]* 41
Donbass Strike Committees Meet *[Moscow Radio]* 41
Miners Dissatisfaction Reportedly 'Growing' *[Moscow TV]* 41

Scientific

Radiation Still High Near Chernobyl *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 28 Feb]* 41
Modernization of Communications Discussed *[Moscow TV]* 42

Military

Yazov Visits Western Group Forces *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 5 Mar]* 42
Moiseyev Cited on 'Nuclear Parity' *[TRUD 5 Mar]* 42
Colonel Reviews Iraqi Weaponry Effectiveness *[Moscow International]* 44
Navy Chief Chernavin Addresses Writers *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 2 Mar]* 45

REGIONAL AFFAIRS

Baltic Republics

Landsbergis Holds News Conference 4 Mar *[Radio Vilnius]* 46
Landsbergis Comments on USSR Referendum *[Radio Vilnius]* 46
Lithuanian CP Official on Holding Referendum *[TASS]* 47
Baltic Representatives Meet With UK's Major *[Tallinn Radio]* 47
  Lithuanian Delegate Comments *[Radio Vilnius]* 48
Lithuanian Representative to USSR Cabinet Named *[EKHO LITVY 21 Feb]* 48
Nordic Countries Warned on Baltic Interference *[Stockholm SVENSKA DAGBLADET 28 Feb]* 48
Nordic Countries Urged To Push Baltics Forum *[Copenhagen BERLINGSKE TIDENDE 28 Feb]* 49
Sweden Opens Information Bureaus in Baltics *[TASS]* 50
Lithuanian Minister Visits Denmark *[Radio Vilnius]* 50
Lithuanian Party Urges Flexibility Toward USSR *[Vilnius International]* 50
OMON 'Stepping Up' Actions in Lithuania *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 1 Mar]* 51
  Increased Military Presence Noted *[Radio Vilnius]* 51
Prunskiene, Jurkans Doubt Gorbachev Reform Success *[Stockholm SVENSKA DAGBLADET 3 Mar]* 51
Gorbunovs Evaluates Latvian Referendum Results *[Riga Radio]* 52
  Opposing Views Reported *[TASS]* 52
  Referendum Results Analyzed *[Moscow International]* 53
  Republic, Union Referendums Examined *[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA 1 Mar]* 53
Communists Urged To Take Part in 17 Mar Vote *[Riga Radio]* 54
Rubiks Urges Presidential Rule in Republic *[TASS]* 54
U.S. Medical Aid Arrives in Riga *[TASS]* 55
Witnesses to 20 Jan MVD Attack Sought *[SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA 12 Feb]* 55
Investigation Into Riga Bombings Detailed *[IZVESTIYA 1 Mar]* 55

RSFSR

Yeltsin Chairs Union Treaty Commission Meeting *[TASS]* 57
Pro-Yeltsin Rally Planned for 10 Mar *[Radio Rossii]* 57
  Rally Said Banned in Izhevsk *[Radio Rossii]* 57
Moscow To Hold Poll on Mayoral Election 17 Mar *[Moscow TV]* 57
Yeltsin's Tactics Against Gorbachev Analyzed *[PRAVDA 5 Mar]* 57
Presidium Says Referendum Obstacles Unlawful *[Moscow Radio]* 60
Democratic Russia Leader Urges Union 'No' Vote *[Radio Rossii]* 61
Deputy Fears 'Yes' Vote on Union Referendum *[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA 27 Feb]* 61
Democratic Russia Movement Assails Gorbachev *[Radio Rossii]* 61
North Ossetia Deputies Reject RSFSR Referendum *[Moscow Radio]* 62

Soviet Press Divided on Referendum *[Radio Rossii]* 62
Legislature Debates Deputy Recall Law *[PRAVDA 1 Mar]* 62
Agenda for Extraordinary Congress Noted *[PRAVDA 4 Mar]* 63
Deputy Says Legislature in 'Virtual Paralysis' *[TASS]* 63
Paper Alleges Defections Greater Than Admitted *[MOSCOW NEWS No 6]* 64
Silayev Meets With Turkish Businessmen *[TASS]* 64
    Delegation Ends Turkey Visit *[TASS]* 64
Silayev Chairs Agricultural Workers' Meeting *[Moscow Radio]* 65
    Comments on Meeting Goals *[Moscow TV]* 65
    Stresses Need To Help Agriculture *[Moscow Radio]* 65
Moldovan Deputies Appeal to RSFSR Legislature *[TASS]* 66
Kemerovo Oblast Democrats Hold First Meeting *[IZVESTIYA 27 Feb]* 67
Gidaspov Comments on 23 Feb Leningrad Rally *[PRAVDA 26 Feb]* 67
South Russia Cities Form Association *[Moscow Radio]* 68
Association for Economic Policy Set Up in South *[Radio Rossii]* 68
Stavropol Leaseholders Form Union *[Moscow Radio]* 68
Enterprises Set Up Independent Concern *[IZVESTIYA 26 Feb]* 68

Western Republics

PRAVDA on Gorbachev at Belorussian Academy *[1 Mar]* 68
'Major' Moldovan Demonstration Backs Leadership *[TASS]* 75
Ukrainian Communist Party Favors Renewed Union *[PRAVDA UKRAINY 5 Feb]* 75

Caucasus

Further on Disturbances in North, South Ossetia 79
    Tskhinvali 'Increasingly Acute' *[Tbilisi Radio]* 79
    Casualties in South 'Skirmishes' *[Moscow TV]* 79
    TASS Reports South Unrest 80
Georgian CP Denies Links With Mkhedrioni *[TSKHOVREBA 27 Feb]* 80
More Bombs Explode, Cause Damage in Stepanakert 81
    Home Housing Soldiers Hit *[TASS]* 81
    Damage to Dam Cuts Water Supply *[Yerevan Radio]* 81
Armenia Adopts Law on Public, Political Groups *[TASS]* 81
Armenian Supreme Soviet's Decision on Referendums *[Yerevan Radio]* 81

Central Asia

Kazakh President Nazarbayev Interviewed on Unity *[Moscow TV]* 83

United States & Canada

Bessmertnykh, U.S. Envoy Discuss War Aftermath

LD0103210191 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1547 GMT 1 Mar 91

[Text] Moscow, 1 Mar (TASS)—Aleksandr Bessmertnykh, USSR minister of foreign affairs, today received Jack Matlock, the U.S. ambassador in the USSR, at the latter's request. Discussion of specific parameters for a political settlement to the situation that has taken shape following the end of the war in the Persian Gulf was continued. The sides also exchanged views on the content of upcoming Soviet-U.S. contacts at a political level.

Bessmertnykh, Canadian Envoy Discuss Ties

LD0103230391 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1600 GMT 1 Mar 91

[Text] Moscow, 1 Mar (TASS)—Aleksandr Bessmertnykh, USSR minister of foreign affairs, today received Michael Bell, the Canadian ambassador to the USSR, for a discussion on some issues of bilateral relations. The Soviet minister spoke in favor of preserving what has been acheived in the sphere of a political dialogue and multifaceted cooperation between the Soviet Union and Canada, and for ensuring stability and predictability in the development of the whole range of Soviet-Canadian relations.

Arctic Cooperation Conference With Canada Opens

LD1802102891 Moscow TASS in English 1017 GMT 18 Feb 91

[By TASS correspondent Mikhail Ivanov]

[Text] Moscow February 18 TASS—The second Soviet-Canadian conference on cooperation in the Arctic opened in Moscow's House of Friendship today. Its organizers are the Union of Soviet Societies of Friendship and Cultural Relations With Foreign Countries and the Canadian Armaments Control Centre.

The agenda includes items relating to Soviet-Canadian bilateral relations, prospects for cooperation in environmental protection in the Arctic, aspects of geostrategy in the northern seas and arms control in the Arctic, and problems of ethnic minorities in the north.

Participants include Soviet Foreign Ministry department heads, experts in military-political problems of the Arctic region, and prominent Soviet scientists specializing in the development of building, power engineering and transportation in the north and Arctic regions. Canada is represented by parliamentarians, specialists from the Armament Control Centre, diplomats, Canadian coast guards and business people.

The first conference of this kind was held in Ottawa in 1989.

Yanayev Receives Delegates

LD2002232391 Moscow TASS in English 1728 GMT 20 Feb 91

[Text] Moscow February 20 TASS—Soviet Vice President Gennadiy Yanayev met today with participants in the second Soviet-Canadian conference on Arctic cooperation, under way in Moscow.

Yanayev described perestroyka in the Soviet Union and the government's measures to stabilise the economic and political situation.

He reaffirmed the USSR's and Canada's commitment to broadening their dialogue and their mutual interest in handling immediate problems of cooperation in the Arctic.

Of great importance is the vigorous character of Soviet-Canadian interaction in various spheres, including the reduction of the ecological threat to ethnic groups living in that region.

First ASTEC Agroindustrial Meeting Held

91UF0497A Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 15 Feb 91 p 3

[Article by A. Balebanov: "First Meeting"]

[Text] The first meeting of the Agroindustrial Committee of the American-Soviet Trade and Economic Council (ASTEC) has opened in Moscow.

This influential public organization includes about 350 major American corporations and banks, the Chamber of Commerce and Association of Industrialists of the United States and several individual states, as well as over 230 Soviet ministries, departments, organizations, enterprises, and cooperatives. The main goal of the Agroindustrial Committee is to render active assistance in the development of all possible forms of partnership between American and Soviet organizations, associations, and companies operating in the sphere of agroindustrial production and related fields on the basis of a mutual exchange of ideas, technologies, and business undertakings.

The meeting will last two days. An account of it will be published in SELSKAYA ZHIZN.

China

Ivashko Continues Official Visit to PRC

Tours Shanghai Car Factory

LD0103152191 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1124 GMT 1 Mar 91

[by TASS special correspondent Vladimir Oreshin]

[Text] Shanghai, 1 Mar—In a warm and friendly atmosphere meetings were held today between V.A. Ivashko, deputy general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and the management and workers of the 'Shanghai-Volkswagen' motor-vehicle construction company.

This major modern enterprise, with its high level of production culture, V.A. Ivashko noted, is an example of what countries and peoples can achieve when their efforts are pooled in peaceful conditions. There is every opportunity, he added, for the development of equally successful Soviet-Chinese cooperation.

Soviet specialists, veterans of the works recalled, have made a large contribution to establishing China's motor vehicle construction industry. Cooperating with them was easier than with our German colleagues, emphasized Wan Zhu-Tsun, the enterprise's party committee secretary. The specialists from Germany are to us friends and business partners, he said. The Soviets are our comrades. Our cooperation with the USSR is one of interaction and mutual assistance between two socialist countries.

V.A. Ivashko also visited a large bridge construction site across the River Huang Pu and viewed the sights of Shanghai.

Talks With Shanghai Mayor Zhu Rongji

LD0203054591 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1800 GMT 1 Mar 91

[By TASS special correspondent Vladimir Oreshin]

[Text] Shanghai, 1 Mar (TASS)--The USSR and the PRC are united not only by a common border, but our two countries are two great socialist powers that are playing a significant part in the world's affairs. This was stated here today by Vladimir Ivashko, deputy secretary general of the CPSU Central Committee, in a conversation with Zhu Rongji, secretary of the Shanghai CPC committee and mayor of Shanghai.

We cannot say that the processes of renewal, perestroyka, and reforms that are taking place in our countries are going easily, V.A. Ivashko pointed out. For this reason, it is very important for us to know and understand each other better and to assimilate everything that is most useful from the experience of reform in the neighboring country. Of course, he continued, blind copying will not do any good. With a common apprach to the principal issue, it is necessary to take into consideration the full extent of the specific features of each country. In this sense, Shanghai has been of considerable interest for us, since the economic reforms here are developing very dynamically, Ivashko said.

The Chinese people, particularly the people of the older generation, Zhu Rongji pointed out, have deep and warm feelings toward the motherland of the Great October Socialist Revolution. Each meeting with Soviet guests gives us great satisfaction, he added. Zhu Rongji briefed V.A. Ivashko on the activities of the city's government and told him about the program for setting up in Shanghai the "Pudong" area of accelerated technological and economic development.

In the evening, a dinner was given by the leadership of Shanghai in honor of the esteemed Soviet guest.

PRC Spokesman on Ivashko Talks

OW0203064291 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 1400 GMT 1 Mar 91

[Report by Beijing correspondent (Papoyan) from the "Current Events and Commentary" program]

[Text] Duan Jin, spokesman of the Chinese Foreign Affairs Ministry, said at a news briefing: After the normalization of Soviet-Chinese relations on May 1989, the two countries have developed relations in various fields, including that of military affairs, based on the principle of equality and mutual benefit. In his answers to reporters, he pointed out that contacts in the field of military affairs help improve mutual understanding.

Duan Jin said: The two sides are currently making preparations for a visit to China by the Soviet defense minister. Quoting a speech by Jiang Zemin, general secretary of the CPC Central Committee, during a meeting with Vladimir Ivashko, deputy general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, Duan Jin said: The CPC greatly hopes to develop relations and contacts in all fields with the CPSU. He said: China cherishes sincere friendship with the Soviet people and [words indistinct] to provide commodity loans to China [as heard]. The Soviet Union has abundant resources, advanced science and technology, and a strong industrial basis. We believe the Soviet people certainly will be able to overcome their domestic difficulties.

The spokesman of the Chinese Foreign Ministry then spoke on the Gulf situation. He said: China happily learned that Kuwait has resumed its sovereignty. China welcomes the cessation of military operations in the Gulf region by the United States.

Duan Jin said: The Chinese Government has all along advocated Kuwait's resumption of independence, sovereignty, territorial integrity, and legitimate political power since the first day of the Gulf crisis. China hopes that Kuwait will heal the wounds of war as soon as possible. He said: As in the past, the Chinese Government will continue to develop and strengthen the friendly and cooperative relations between the two countries on the basis of the principle of peaceful coexistence.

Chinese Reportage on Ivashko Visit

WA0103144391

For Chinese reportage on the visit to the PRC by Vladimir Ivashko, deputy secretary general of the CPSU Central Committee, please see the Soviet Union section of the 26 February China DAILY REPORT and subsequent issues.

Ivashko Comments on Visit

LD0203095491 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0815 GMT 2 Mar 91

[By TASS correspondent Vladimir Oreshin]

[Text] Beijing, 2 Mar (TASS)—V.A. Ivashko, deputy general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, described his visit to the PRC as successful and fruitful in an interview with a TASS correspondent.

In a discussion with Jiang Zemin, general secretary of the CPC, Ivashko emphasized, there was a substantive exchange of views on issues on developing bilateral relations, topical problems of international life, and general approaches to the development of Soviet-Chinese contacts.

We view the Chinese leadership's initiative to provide significant goods credit for the USSR as an effective, friendly act of great political significance, declared V.A. Ivashko. It is very important for us that the Chinese comrades see the difficulties that the Soviet Union is going through currently as a transitory phenomenon and do not doubt that we will be able to overcome them. The Chinese Communists' moral support for the renewal processes in the Soviet Union is of great importance for us.

All in all, the results of the meetings and talks with Chinese comrades make it possible to conclude that the development of Soviet-Chinese relations is on the right road, emphasized the deputy general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

V.A. Ivashko conveyed to Jiang Zemin a message from M.S. Gorbachev. Having highly appraised the progress in the development of Soviet-Chinese relations achieved since May 1989, the Chinese leader declared his desire to visit the Soviet Union this year to continue political dialogue at a higher level.

V.A. Ivashko held talks with Qiao Shi, member of the Permanent Committee of the CPC Central Committee Politburo, and travelled to Shanghai, where he held discussions with the leadership of the city.

Today V.A. Ivashko left for home.

Ivashko Sees 'Much of Value' in China

PM0403230191 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 Mar 91 Second Edition pp 1, 5

["Our Interview" in Beijing with V.A. Ivashko, deputy general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, by correspondent B. Barakhta under the rubric "World and Politics"; date not given: "New Step Toward Each Other"]

[Text] [Ivashko] This was my first time in the PRC and my first trip abroad as deputy general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. This visit to the PRC logically falls within the context of relations between our countries and parties. Our countries and peoples have long been linked by very friendly relations. There are many explanations for this—and certainly not just our common border more than 7,000 km long. Our peoples have much in common: great diligence and the ability to work under complex conditions and to achieve results. At the same time there have been inauspicious periods, I would say, in our relations. From the beginning of the sixties, for example, relations between our countries became cool and even strained. Naturally, that benefited neither us nor the Chinese people. This can now be seen clearly. And then a very portentous event occurred two years ago: M.S. Gorbachev's visit to the PRC was a new milestone, as it were, a starting point in our bilateral relations. From May 1989 interstate and interparty ties began to acquire a dynamic, and their level began to rise. It is within the chain of such events that our coming to the PRC must be viewed.

During my stay in China talks and conversations have taken place and, so it seems to me, have highlighted a very great deal. We met with Comrade Jiang Zemin, general secretary of the CPC Central Committee. It was a long and very productive conversation. I would say that it touched on the philosophical bases of our relations. The situation inside our countries and the situation in the international arena were examined in a frank atmosphere, in an atmosphere of complete openness, and the dynamics of Soviet-Chinese relations at the present stage were analyzed.

On the initiative of Comrade Jiang Zemin we are being afforded considerable commodity credit. We regard this as a very earnest, friendly step toward the USSR. And it is not so much a question of the amount of credit as of the political significance of this initiative.

Knowing the complexity of our position, the Chinese comrades recalled the times when our people helped the Chinese people. And this is very significant.

During the conversation I passed to Comrade Jiang Zemin a message from Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev inviting him to pay an official friendly visit to the USSR. I do not think there is any need to explain that top-level meetings give the boost which sets all state and party mechanisms in motion for the development of concrete cooperation at the new stage.

We hope that Comrade Jiang Zemin's upcoming visit will help to bring Soviet-Chinese relations up to a qualitatively new level.

During my stay in Beijing I had talks with Comrade Qiao Shi, member of the Politburo Standing Committee and secretary of the CPC Central Committee. In addition to analyzing perestroyka in the USSR and the policy of reforms and external openness in the PRC, great attention was devoted to questions of interparty ties. The place of ruling parties in the political system of each of our countries has its own specific nature, but the general assessment of the situation is clear: Progress in our states can be achieved only on the paths of socialism. And the CPC and the CPSU are a constructive force in the matter of its renewal.

We met with comrades from the Chinese Society for Friendly Relations with Foreign Countries. That totally unconstrained meeting is also of considerable significance, since it opens up new possibilities for a manifestation of people's diplomacy. Such meetings make it possible to expand ties not only at the level of state organs and interparty organizations but also at the level of the broadest public.

Summing up the first result of the trip, I can say that ties between our countries and between the CPSU and the CPC have a stable and quite dynamic tendency toward further development. New visits and meetings and specific joint actions lie ahead.

I wish to emphasize one more aspect. The meetings and conversations in China have shown that our approaches in international politics coincide or, at least, are close. This is a major factor in the system of international relations.

It is very important that the assessments of the visit both in our country and in China are positive.

I must also speak about studying the experience of Chinese comrades. I wish to point out that I am categorically opposed to a stereotyped approach to the practice of other parties and countries. There are many people in our country who believe that it is possible to take U.S., Chinese, or Japanese experience and translate it to our Soviet soil. That is foolhardy, to say the least. Every country has its own special features, and we have repeatedly burned our fingers when we have tried to make a "copy" of some other experience. In turning to the PRC's experience, I believe that what is very valuable for us is the approaches and the specific forms and methods of work, particularly in economic life, which can be modified with regard to our conditions.

I was convinced of this during my trip to Shanghai. The city is going through an extremely important stage in its development. It is a question of the bold and decisive introduction of new economic thinking in a socialist country. There is much of value and interest to us here.

On leaving China I am taking away my conviction as to my former ideas on the need for radical reforms under conditions of socialism. We do not have very much experience of such transformations and we do not have enough trained cadres, and so we frequently encounter fantastic projects for transformations. This is not only because some of the projects' authors have studied life only from their own works. It is also the case that, in trying to blindly copy the practice of developed capitalist states, they forget about those countries which are next to us, like China, for example, which began its path of transformations under conditions of a socialist state. Every journey, however long, starts with the first step. And it must be traveled step by step, as China is doing.

A new economic region is being created in Shanghai. What did they start with there? The creation of an infrastructure, including hotels, bridges, roads, a currency exchange, and other projects of this kind. All this attracts foreign capital and new technologies.

It is a pity that we spent so little time in Shanghai. However, we saw quite a lot even in this space of time. For example, the very modern "Shanghai-Santana" joint venture for the production of motor vehicles, the construction of a major bridge, and the central Shanghai department store, which is already working under conditions of a regulated market.

I will repeat once again that experience must not be thoughtlessly transferred to a different soil. Painstaking, consistent work is needed. But interesting experience must not be disregarded either.

I would like to point out the great hospitality of the Chinese comrades and their frankness and openness. This is an important factor in the further successful development of our relations.

Improving Ties Prove 'Bitter Lessons' Learned

LD0103231491 Moscow World Service in English 1210 GMT 1 Mar 91

[Aleksey Kondratyev commentary]

[Text] Understandably, world public attention is riveted on the Gulf events. Besides, no one can any longer expect contacts between Soviet and Chinese officials to prove sensational. These contacts have become routine and are predictable. They can't damage the interests of third nations. On the contrary, normal ties between the two countries, with quite an impressive territory and pupulation, stabilize the situation in the Asia-Pacific region in the first place.

It would be naive to claim that the world has lost interest in Soviet-Chinese relations. Clearly, Moscow and Beijing are restoring party ties under a watchful eye. Dozens of political parties in other nations are closely watching this. No wonder, with the complicated political changes in this country, Soviet-Chinese relations are still determined to a great extent by the two countries' ruling parties. These relations have been quickly changing for the better since the Soviet-Chinese summit in May 1989, a summit that closed the past and opened the future. They've involved economic cooperation in foreign policy, science, and the cultural and military area. Regional cooperation, too, has been gaining momentum. Some agreements have already been signed and more are yet to come.

The very tone of Soviet-Chinese relations is significant. It's no longer didactic. On the contrary, it's businesslike and good wishing. The two countries want their relations to remain neighborly. They've economic, political, military and strategic considerations in mind, and this is important for many other nations.

Isn't it remarkable that the two nuclear powers are at long last restoring peace and quiet along the common border. Moscow and Beijing have been pressing for closer cooperation. Some may say the 2 years that have passed since the Soviet-Chinese summit are too short a time to sum it up, but I believe the Soviet Union and China can hardly roll back the years of alienation. They too haVe paid dearly for those years. But the one and the other seemed to have learned the bitter lessons of the not-so-distant past.

Northeast Asia

Delegation Attends Mongolian Party Congress

Malofeyev-led Delegation Arrives

LD2302221491 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1400 GMT 23 Feb 91

[Text] A CPSU delegation headed by Anatoliy Malofeyev, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member and first secretary of the Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee, arrived in Ulaanbaatar today to participate in the work of the 20th Congress of the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party, which opens 25 February.

Party Congress Opens

LD2502035491 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0133 GMT 25 Feb 91

[By TASS correspondents Vyacheslav Poznakharev, Dugar Sanzhiyev, Aleksandr Chernov]

[Text] Ulaanbataar, 25 Feb (TASS)—A routine congress, the 20th, of the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party [MPRP] opened here today in the conference hall of the People's Great Hural of the MPR [Mongolian People's Republic]. Over 400 delegates representing almost 120,000 members of the ruling political organization in the country are taking part in its work. They are to define the main directions of the party's activities in the new conditions of Mongolia's social and economic development, in which the multiparty system has been affirmed and the transition to market relations in the economy is being carried out, and to outline ways to deepen the process of renewal of the party itself and society.

Delegations of the CPSU and the CPC are present at the congress. A.A. Malofeyev, member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and first secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Belorussia, is heading the Soviet Communists' envoys.

Mongolian Radio and Television are broadcasting a live report on the work of the 20th MPRP Congress. The forum is expected to last three days. Gombojavyn Ochirbat, chairman of the MPRP Central Committee, is delivering a report "On the Sociopolitical Situation in the MPR and the Tasks of the MPRP" to the congress.

MPRP Leader Receives Delegations

LD2602110891 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0910 GMT 26 Feb 91

[By TASS Correspondent Vyacheslav Poznakharev]

[Text] Ulaanbaatar, 26 Feb (TASS)—Gomboyabyn Ochirbat, Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party [MPRP] Central Committee chairman, received a CPSU delegation led by Anatoliy Malofeyev, Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee first secretary and CPSU Central Committee Politburo member. The delegation is attending the 20th MPRP Congress at the invitation of the MPRP Central Committee. Natsagiyn Bagabandi, MPRP Central Committee secretary and Presidium member, and Vasiliy Sitnikov, USSR ambassador to the Mongolian People's Republic, took part in the conversation.

G. Ochirbat received a CPC delegation led by Wang Qun, CPC Central Committee member, who is also attending the congress today.

CPSU, CPC Greetings Read at Congress

LD2602101491 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1537 GMT 25 Feb 91

[By TASS correspondents Vyacheslav Poznakharev, Dugar Sanzhiyev, and Aleksandr Chernov]

[Text] Ulaanbaatar, 25 Feb (TASS)—Anatoliy Malofeyev, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, first secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Belorussia, and CPSU delegation head, spoke at the 20th Congress of the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party during the afternoon. He was warmly received by the delegates and participants. Greeting delegates on behalf of the CPSU Central Committee, he said that the processes of the democratic renewal of Mongolia are being followed with interest in the Soviet Union. He wished the Mongolian comrades success in the struggle to strengthen the authority of the party—the bearer of revolutionary traditions and genuine democratic changes consolidating the forces of Mongolian society.

Qualitative changes in the life of the USSR and Mongolia and in the activity of the CPSU and the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party are imparting new features to inter-party links, A. Malofeyev noted. We strive constantly to build them upon a foundation of equality of rights, upon respect for each other's views and positions, upon complete trust and genuine comradeliness, he said. Ties between the CPSU and the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party will remain an effective factor in the development of Soviet-Mongolian cooperation, the CPSU delegation head stressed. He valued highly the constructive contribution of the Mongolian People's Republic in the resolution of pan-Asian problems. On the instructions of the CPSU Secretariat, A. Malofeyev presented greetings to the Central Committee of the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party on the occasion of the party's 70th anniversary.

A message of greetings from the CPC Central Committee was read out at the evening sitting. The Chinese Communists express confidence that the Mongolian people will be able successfully to overcome the difficulties on the path of socialist creativity and renewal, the document stresses. The message from the CPC Central Committee expresses confidence that relations between the two parties will continue to be built upon the principles of mutual respect and non-interference in each other's internal affairs, and relations between the two neighboring states will be built upon the basis of the five principles of peaceful coexistence.

CPSU Greetings on 70th Anniversary

PM0403163791 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 1 Mar 91 Second Edition p 4

[CPSU Central Committee Secretariat anniversary message to Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party Central Committee]

[Text] To the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party [MPRP] Central Committee.

In connection with the 70th anniversary of the foundation of the MPRP we wish the Central Committee and all members of the MPRP great creative effort and success in the historically important cause of renewal and democratization of Mongolian society.

We are sure that the CPSU and MPRP will actively ensure the preservation and development of everything positive that has been created through the joint efforts of our two countries' peoples in various spheres of Soviet-Mongolian cooperation over many decades.

[Signed] CPSU Central Committee Secretariat.

Congress Debate Examines 'Renewal'

PM0103121591 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Feb 91 Second Edition p 6

[Report by correspondent V. Sapov: "What Kind of Party Is It To Be? At the 20th Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party Congress"]

[Text] Ulaanbaatar, 26 Feb—The 20th Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party [MPRP] Congress is continuing its work in Ulaanbaatar. It is taking place in a businesslike atmosphere of extensive glasnost and openness. The forum is attended by delegations from the CPSU and the CPC.

The debate is focusing on questions of the renewal of the party and its activity and program documents. Most of the speakers agree that the MPRP is the most influential political organization in Mongolia. For 70 years it has been leading the country along the socialist path. There have been successes and failures. The party itself felt the full weight of the pernicious deformations of the personality cult years, but it stood its ground and found the strength to begin perestroyka within itself. And although it now faces massive criticism, the question of whether the party should exist or not is not on the agenda. The congress will answer the question as to what kind of party it is going to be.

With 120,000 communists in its ranks, the MPRP has its roots in the masses and expresses working people's fundamental aspirations. Suffice it to say that 40.1 percent of its membership comprises stockmen, farmers, and workers.

Support for the MPRP is also indicated by the following figure. Since the 19th congress its membership has increased by 12,200—two-thirds of these joining since the extraordinary congress last April. In five years the influx of new members has increased by 150 percent.

Nearly all the speakers voiced opinions on the party program and rules. Two versions of each document were submitted. There was a debate about the nature of the party. The majority favor regarding the MPRP as a party of people's democracy, championing the ideas of scientific socialism. It will follow in its actions the principles of free social development and national accord. Humanity, peace, equality, and friendship among peoples—these are the foundations on which the MPRP's theoretical, ideological, educational, political-organizational, and parliamentary activity are being built.

It was proposed that the word "revolutionary" be removed from the MPRP's name. The proposal received no backing at the congress. Nor did the congress delegates support efforts to expunge from the documents assessments of Marxism-Leninism as the theoretical basis of MPRP activity.

It is proposed that the rules incorporate provisions on the attitude to the "opposition" minority and on the holding of an all-party debate.

There was a heated discussion of the question of the structure of party organs, the transition to self-financing, and the question of changing the procedure for collecting membership dues.

There were some other "radical" proposals: That the party should function only within a parliamentary context, for instance. Some proposed the abolition of the Central Committee and its apparatus and the aimak and city committees.

In short, a vigorous quest is in progress for a new complexion for the MPRP.

Need for North-South Korea Compromises Viewed

SK0203062291 Moscow International Service in Korean 1100 GMT 1 Mar 91

[Sergey Petrov commentary]

[Text] Quoting government sources, the YONHAP News Agency of the ROK has described the nature and scale of the Team Spirit ROK- U.S. joint military exercise, which is being conducted this year.

Our station commentator Sergey Petrov writes on this:

Let us analyze, first of all, the numbers given by the YONHAP News Agency. Approximately 140,000 troops were mobilized in the Team Spirit exercise. This is a 27-percent reduction when compared to the number of troops mobilized last year. This military exercise will reach its climax on 11 March. No U.S. aircraft carrier will participate in this military exercise. However, a spokesman for the ROK-U.S. Combined Forces Command refused to officially comment on this. Even though it is said that this joint military exercise has been scaled down, it is, still, one of the largest joint military exercise in the world. The fact that a nuclear-powered submarine and other pieces of equipment armed with nuclear weapons are participating in this military exercise seriously threatens peace in this region.

Meanwhile, the U.S. Department of State has released a statement that says that this military exercise is being conducted in a region far away from the North Korean border and that it is a purely defensive exercise. This is what the U.S. side insists on. However, we cannot help but consider the fact that the Team Spirit military exercise is being conducted near the Soviet border. I think that a military exercise of this sort is very dangerous under circumstances in which there is no organization which reliably controls military and political affairs in the Far East.

What influence does this military exercise exert upon the Korean Peninsula? It exerts a very negative influence, thus leading dialogue between the Korean sides to a crisis every year. Under the excuse of the start of the Team Spirit exercise, North Korea suspended a premier-level meeting with the ROK. Last Tuesday, Pyongyang released an order to all the units of the North Korean Armed Forces that they will assume a combat mobilization posture. Prior to this, [words indistinct]. This has complicated everything; has led the situation on the Korean Peninsula, which had been tense even without it, to be gloomier; and has made it difficult to predict how the situation will develop. One can easily imagine what a horrific occurrence would result if any acute incident were to take place under circumstances in which mutual mistrust prevails and in which military preparations are being made in earnest.

The Korean war broke out 45 years ago. New conflicts may take place and may be more dangerous. Political solutions are necessary to prevent such conflicts. Political will by one side, if not by the two sides, is very necessary today. For example, does Washington have any reason that it cannot greatly reduce the scale of the Team Spirit exercise or completely suspend it? The Soviet Union does not conduct a military exercise of this scale in the Far East. However, the Soviet Union does not [words indistinct], and can contribute to easing tension between the Korean sides.

I would like to point out the fact that Seoul and Pyongyang had almost agreed on the issue of adopting a nonaggression declaration in the first premier-level talks. Then, problems could be solved in reality, couldn't they? The two sides must solve all the problems by making reasonable compromises, instead of insisting on their own way.

USSR, South Korea Sign Trade Accord in Moscow

LD0203013691 Moscow World Service in English 2000 GMT 1 Mar 91

[Text] The Soviet Union and South Korea signed an intergovernmental trade agreement in Moscow today. The accord provides broad opportunities to promote business ties between the two countries at an accelerated pace. This year's trade turnover may run up to $800 million. Last year, bilateral shipments were worth a billion dollars. South Korea will supply to the Soviet Union consumer goods and equipment for new works to manufacture video facilities, medical instruments, and medicines.

Japanese Ambassador Edamura Meets Officials

Meets Polozkov

PM2802102991 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 21 Feb 91 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report under general headline "Official Reports": "Talks Held"]

[Text] I.K. Polozkov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Communist Party Central Committee, received S. Edamura, Japanese ambassador to the USSR, 20 February.

The talks, which were held in an amicable and friendly atmosphere, touched on issues of Soviet-Japanese relations and the forthcoming visit to Japan by USSR President M.S. Gorbachev. Answering the ambassador's questions, I.K. Polozkov talked in detail about the Russian Communist Party's positions on key issues of social development. It was stressed that the RSFSR Communist Party, proceeding on the basis of the interests of both countries' peoples, will promote the expansion and strengthening of Soviet-Japanese interstate relations and, within that framework, of relations between the RSFSR and Japan as well.

Meets Dzasokhov

LD0103231791 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1635 GMT 1 Mar 91

[Text] Moscow, 1 Mar (TASS)—Aleksandr Dzasokhov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet International Affairs Committee, today received Sumio Edamura, Japanese ambassador to the USSR.

During the course of a conversation, the ambassador reaffirmed the great interest being shown in Japan in the forthcoming visit of USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev, noting at the same time that a national committee of preparation, headed by Shintaro Abe, the former foreign minister, had been set up. The general background of the preparations for the visit is being conducted in a constructive spirit. Priority is being given to the development of Japanese-Soviet economic, scientific-technical, and cultural cooperation.

During a discussion on international questions, Aleksandr Dzasokhov drew attention to the efforts of the head of the Soviet state in transferring the hostilities in the Persian Gulf zone into a channel of a political settlement. The readiness of the USSR to cooperate with all the member countries of the UN Security Council in settling all the problems of this region was reaffirmed. He noted that the depth and constructive nature of Soviet-Japanese relations will in many ways depend on bringing their positive factors to the forefront.

Meets Deputy Foreign Minister

LD0403111991 Moscow TASS in English 1027 GMT 4 Mar 91

[Text] Moscow March 4 TASS—Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Aleksandr Belonogov today met Japanese ambassador to the Soviet Union Sumio Edamura.

They discussed the Gulf conflict and prospects for the development of the situation in the region and in the Middle East as a whole. The sides noted the similarity of their approaches to the issue.

Frolov Confers With Businessmen in Japan

PM0503093991 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 1 Mar 91 Second Edition p 4

[Report by correspondent I. Latyshev: "Discussion With Businessmen. USSR-Japan: Mutual Interest in Cooperation"]

[Text] Tokyo, 28 Feb—The Japanese have an insatiable interest in perestroyka in the Soviet Union. The media, political circles, and leading organizations in the Japanese business world are keeping a close watch on the reforms that are being conducted in our country.

Local business leaders are linking various plans for Japanese-Soviet economic cooperation to perestroyka. This was further confirmed by the meetings between Academician I.T. Frolov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chief editor of PRAVDA, and prominent representatives of Japanese business circles, held in the building of the Japanese businessmen's central headquarters—the Federation of Economic Organizations (Keidanren).

Over 50 presidents and managing directors of major Japanese companies and some distinguished academics met yesterday in the federation building's assembly hall to hear a lecture by I.T. Frolov analyzing the course of perestroyka and the current situation in the Soviet Union. "This lecture," Professor Nobuyuki Fukuda, well-known Japanese academic and director of the Institute of Combined Research, said in his introductory speech, "was conceived of and is being given as one of the events connected with the preparation of the country's business and scientific circles for USSR President Gorbachev's upcoming April visit." Warmly greeted by the assembled guests, the Soviet visitor covered in detail a number of acute questions of the present stage of perestroyka, focusing attention on those that are engendering the greatest debate in the Soviet Union and abroad. The lecture was listened to very attentively and it prompted a lively debate.

The discussion of questions connected with perestroyka in the Soviet Union and with the prospects for the development of Soviet-Japanese business cooperation was then continued with a smaller group of Keidanren executive leaders. During the discussion the federation's representatives touched on certain difficulties that have arisen in the course of perestroyka and have given the Japanese side cause for concern. In particular, they expressed the wish that the Soviet side should accelerate the completion of the reorganization of the country's national economic management structure. Particular emphasis was placed on the need for the delimitation on the scale of the Soviet Union as a whole of the functions and authority of central departments and local, regional organizations, above all those which have appeared recently in Far East regions of our country and are seeking to establish direct links with Japanese business circles. During the conversations the Japanese side repeatedly stressed its keenness that business people in the Soviet Union should master as quickly as possible the knowledge and skills of entrepreneurial activity that are essential for the transition to a market economy. In this connection, they announced their intention to disseminate in our country textbooks translated into Russian and intended for compatriots of ours engaged in the management of enterprises, banking operations, and commerce.

I.T. Frolov had a very substantive conversation with Isamu Yamashita, chairman of the Japanese-Soviet committee for economic cooperation and, at the same time, head of one of the country's biggest railroad companies. The conversation was about the prospects for Soiet-Japanese cooperation in the sphere of science and technology. Mr. Yamashita noted the high level of development in the Soviet Union of the basic research that is being carried out in USSR Academy of Sciences scientific research centers, on the one hand, and Japanese scientists' great achievements in the sphere of applied technological research, on the other hand. In this connection, both sides drew attention to the mutual benefits the Soviet Union and Japanesee would derive from an exchange of information and cooperation between the two countries in a number of important spheres of science and technology.

During the same conversation the Soviet visitor informed the Japanese side of the new statutes of the USSR Academy of Sciences, of the changes in its organizational structure, and of the preparation at the USSR Supreme Soviet of new draft laws envisaging strengthening academic scientific institutions' autonomy and making their work more effective. The Japanese side was very interested in the news of the establishment in the USSR of an All-Union Center for Human Sciences and the outline of the major research program on the topic "Man amid new technology." Displaying a willingness to cooperate in this matter, the representatives of the Federation of Economic Organizations told the Soviet visitor of the preparations they are making for the Japanese-Soviet scientific-technical symposium that is being held in Tokyo in March and the corresponding exhibition that is intended to acquaint the Japanese public with Soviet scientists' and designers' latest achievements.

I.T. Frolov's conversation's at the headquarters of Japan's Federation of Economic Organizations thus confirmed once again the interest throughout the Japanese business world in M.S. Gorbachev's upcoming visit to the country and the willingness of a number of Japanese firms to expand contacts with the Soviet Union.

Soviet-Japanese Fishery Talks Open in Moscow

OW2702121791 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1200 GMT 26 Feb 91

[Text] Every year around this time, a meeting of the Soviet-Japanese Fishery Committee is held in Moscow or Tokyo. It is Moscow's turn this year, and the seventh regular meeting was held at the Ministry of Fish Industry yesterday.

Mr. Petr Lashko, first deputy director of Dal Ryba State Production Enterprise, addressed the opening session. He said as follows:

I would like to note with satisfaction that the traditional and amicable relationship in the fishing sector between the two countries is playing an important role in the overall bilateral relations. Thanks to the efforts of both sides, the two countries have been able to solve a number of issues dealing with biological resources within the 200 nautical miles, thus succeeding in maintaining the direction of advance toward a new form of reciprocal relations. We are to review at this regular meeting questions related to catching salmon and trout in the northeast Pacific. Frankly speaking, they are complicated and diverse questions.

On the one hand, there is the position that catching salmon and trout in the open sea is extremely irrational. This position is receiving understanding and support from the nations in the Pacific region, and support from the whole world when the question of using drift nets is involved.

On the other hand, we have to seriously think about maintaining the traditional relationship of cooperation in the utilization of resources of salmon and trout, and to link this to the academic studies to enable the rational and cost-effective utilization of salmon and trout resources.

In addition, we would like to have discussions on further promotion of joint ventures in the Soviet Union and on the long-term outlook of the joint venture businesses. In the meeting this time, we would also like to have discussions on other questions, such as cooperation in science and technology.

The seventh regular session is being held before President Gorbbachev's upcoming visit. This gives a special meaning to the meeting. I hope that this meeting will be one which shows that both countries sincerely desire expanded bilateral relations in the fishing field. This will help promote amicable atmosphere in the bilateral relations.

That was what Mr. Lashko of the Soviet delegation said.

In response, Michio Shimada, chief of the Fishery Agency's Deepsea Fishing Department, representing Japan, spoke as follows:

[Begin recording] As regards the salmon and trout fishing situation, frank views were exchanged in informal talks between Zilanov, deputy minister of the Soviet Ministry of the Fish Industry, and Choya, director general of the Japanese Fishery Agency.

Now at this new meeting, we are prepared to listen earnestly to the position of the Soviet Union. We strongly hope, on the other hand, that the Soviet side will understand the difficult situation Japan is facing on the salmon and trout fishing question.

We are also to discuss at this meeting cooperation in science and technology for 1991. Cooperation between Japan and the Soviet Union in fishing will be more effectively enforced when Japanese-Soviet fishery relations are stable and expanding.

I think that if cooperation can be achieved based on this spirit of reciprocity, both sides will benefit.

Last, I hope that frank and sincere views will be expressed at this meeting and that a satisfactory solution will be found soon—before President Gorbachev visits Japan in April. Thank you. [end recording]

Near East & South Asia

TASS Reports Saddam Call on Iraqis To Resist

LD0303093791 Moscow TASS in English 0913 GMT 3 Mar 91

[TASS at 1015 GMT on 3 March kills the following item]

[Text] Nicosia March 3 TASS—Iraqi President Saddam Husayn on Sunday addressed the country's servicemen and citizens, saying that the United States and its allies had committed an act of treachery and begun the offensive before the moment when the U.N. Security Council could act in accordance with the Soviet peace plan supported by Iraq. He called upon Iraqis to resist this offensive with all their strength.

Shortly before Saddam's address, Baghdad Radio welcomed the beginning of the great battle. A radio commentary stressed that Baghdad was not going to yield to threats.

The Iraqi leadership already appointed top officers who are expected to attend the ceasefire talks with allied forces' commanders today, the INA news agency reported.

Reports from the Iraqi capital say that check-points were set up on all of Baghdad's main streets and cross-roads.

Gorbachev Aide Hopes for Saddam Ouster

AU0403220191 Paris AFP in English 2047 GMT 4 Mar 91

[Text] Luxembourg, March 4 (AFP)— A diplomatic advisor to Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev on Monday said the regime of Iraqi President Saddam Husayn was "certainly terrorist" and should be changed.

"This regime was certainly terrorist... I hope that this regime will be changed", advisor Vadim Zagladin told the press after talks with Luxembourg Prime Minister Jacques Santer.

Mr. Zagladin warned against replacing Mr. Husayn's government by a Moslem fundamentalist regime. This would "certainly be a threat for everybody", he said.

Mr. Zagladin said a proposal by French President Francois Mitterrand for a summit meeting of all 15 United Nations Security Council members was "very interesting" but "key points" must be agreed on in very serious consultations before any get-together.

All Forces Urged To Find 'Political Solution'

PM0403144791 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 2 Mar 91 First Edition p 3

[Special correspondent Major R. Mustafin report: "All Quiet at the Fronts"]

[Text] Amman—The news of the cease-fire in the Persian Gulf area was received with relief and satisfaction in Jordan. Many Jordanians believe that the principled stance adopted by our country largely contributed to the cease-fire.

The events of the past 24 hours—one of the largest tank battles since the end of World War II near Basra, the acceptance by Iraq of all 12 UN Security Council resolutions on Kuwait, and the cessation of hostilities—have been received here as by no means unequivocal proof of a military defeat—much less a political defeat—of Baghdad. Why?

The Arabs we spoke to in the street today cited the following arguments. First, Iraq managed, on its own, to stand up to the armed forces of 30 states for six weeks. Iraqi soldiers and officers not only managed to hold their ground under massive bombing, but to a considerable degree they also succeeded in retaining their grouping and their troop control combat effectiveness. What happened here during the past 40 days does not resemble the wars of 1956, 1967, or 1973. Second, the Iraqi troops were virtually completely withdrawn from Kuwait before the official announcement of this decision. The withdrawal of the Iraqi troops took place in an organized fashion and in approximately the same order as in August of last year when Iraq invaded Kuwait. A Baghdad Radio announcement pointed out that the troops were not withdrawn as a result of or in conditions of combat actions on the part of the enemy. It is this that also explains the minimal losses of the advancing anti-Iraq coalition troops.

At the same time the Pentagon has announced the rout of 40 out of 42 Iraqi divisions deployed in Kuwait and the south of the country. Israeli Radio reports with reference to a Pentagon spokesman that in the course of heavy fighting 200 Iraqi tanks and 50 armored personnel carriers were destroyed. A total of 900 U.S. tanks took part in the engagement [srazheniye] on the American side against 300 Iraqi tanks from the "Hammurabi" Republican Guard division.

So it is all quiet on the war fronts of the Persian Gulf. Iraq has withdrawn its troops from Kuwait and the multinational forces have been ordered not to open fire unless under attack. It is difficult to say how long this situation will last. What is needed is a political solution to stabilize the situation in this region and this is what people are impatiently waiting for and expecting from the UN Security Council, the leaders of the multinational coalition countries, and Iraq.

Soviet Muslims Said To Demand Saddam Trial

PM0403103591 London SAWT AL-KUWAYT AL-DUWALI in Arabic 28 Feb 91 p 16

[Faruq Radwan report: "Soviet Muslims, Christians Demand Trial of Saddam Husayn"]

[Excerpt] Moscow—A huge demonstration assembled in front of the Kuwaiti Embassy in Moscow. It included Soviet citizens from numerous tendencies. They carried slogans demanding that Saddam Husayn be brought to trial for the crime he has committed against the Kuwaiti people and the destruction he has inflicted on a Muslim Arab state.

SAWT AL-KUWAYT interviewed some of the demonstrators, who expressed their anger at Saddam Husayn's immoral actions. One of them said he was a Muslim and came to express his and every Muslim's wish that Saddam Husayn should stand trial, because he is solely responsible for the Iraqi devastation and the thousands of Muslims killed from among the Kuwaiti and Iraqi peoples. His practices are an attack on Islamic principles because they have led to a split in Muslim ranks at a time when Soviet Muslims are uniting to confront the dangers surrounding Islam.

One Soviet demonstrator demanded that Muslim leaders bring Saddam Husayn to trial on the grounds that he has violated the Muslim consensus. [passage omitted]

Kuwaiti Rebuilding Plans, Major Tasks Reported

PM0403130991 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
2 Mar 91 Union Edition p 4

[Report by correspondent B. Ivanov: "Who Will Restore Kuwait?"]

[Text] Riyadh—After the liberation of Kuwait and the cessation of hostilities on the front, the Kuwaitis' main attention is now shifting to questions of the country's postwar restoration.

According to the preliminary calculations of Kuwaiti Government experts, overcoming the consequences of the Iraqi occupation and fully restoring the emirate's economic potential will cost approximately $60-80 billion. In reality the cost of restoration work may be far greater since right now it is very difficult to assess in full the damage caused by the Iraqis.

On the basis of the fragmentary information coming from Kuwait the following picture is now emerging. The country is virtually paralyzed. There is no electricity, fresh water, fuel, or communications. Power stations, water pumping stations, and desalination plants were blown up. The roads have been "plowed" by thousands of craters from shells and bombs, bridges have been destroyed, and airfields have been damaged. Over 30 percent of the residential and administrative buildings in Kuwait City and other cities have been burned down and the streets are clogged with the remains of burned out military equipment and mountains of garbage, which has not been collected since 2 August of last year, when the Iraqi aggression began.

The Kuwaiti Government's main task in this connection is the immediate and urgent provision of food, drinking water, and necessities for the population. An important step has been taken in this direction: Convoys of trucks with food and water are already arriving in Kuwait from Saudi Arabia. This is the start of deliveries from the stocks which the Kuwaitis had laid in earlier and which, it is believed, should be enough to provide the country's population with everything necessary for the first three months after the war. This is precisely the time in which it was proposed to bring back to life—albeit at the most elementary and minimal level—the daily infrastructure of the capital and other cities, to set up telephone and telex communications with the surrounding world in order later to gradually shift to the main stage of restoration work.

Now this schedule may possibly be revised. The point is that the first studies of the destruction have already shown that the damage to the country's economy from the occupation has proved far greater than previously supposed. Above all this applies to the oil extracting potential. To this day about 600 of the 950 oil wells which operated in Kuwait before the start of the aggression continue to blaze after being set alight by the Iraqis a few days ago. Extinguishing the fires and returning the wells to an operational state—that is perhaps the priority task in terms of importance and urgency facing the Kuwaiti authorities—a very, very difficult task. Experts believe that several months may be needed just to stop the fires in the wells. Another important problem is the restoration of the petroleum cleansing and refining complexes. They have been virtually completely destroyed and to all appearances they will have to be constructed anew. That, according to the most optimistic forecasts, may take at least a year.

Who will restore Kuwait? Kuwaiti Government representatives do not conceal the fact that the main subcontractors for the forthcoming work will be mainly Western and primarily U.S. construction and industrial companies. "The United States played the main role in liberating our country and we shall only welcome the fact if it also assumes the burden of the restoration work," they say. It is no accident that U.S. firms have received over 70 percent of all the contracts already concluded as of today. Alongside U.S. firms, companies from Britain, France, the FRG, and Japan are now conducting active talks on taking part in the restoration work.

Israeli Knesset Member Saguy Interviewed

PM0403115791 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
2 Mar 91 Union Edition p 4

[Interview with Yehoshu'a Saguy, member of the Knesset from the Likud bloc, by correspondents Yevg. Bay and V. Skosyrev in Jerusalem; date of interview not given; first two paragraphs are introduction: "Forty Days in a Sealed Room; IZVESTIYA Special Correspondents Talk in Jerusalem with Former Chief of Israeli Military Intelligence"]

[Text] Jerusalem—Now that the tragedy in the Persian Gulf is coming to an end, observers in many countries are considering the prospects of a postwar peace settlement. Naturally, this question is also being discussed in Israel, whose policy for a long time has served as one of the sources of the upheavals in the Near East. To ascertain how Tel Aviv assesses the results of the crisis and the possibility of eliminating the Arab-Israeli conflict, we turned to Lieutenant General Yehoshu'a Saguy (retired), a member of the Knesset from the ruling "Likud" bloc.

In 1976 Saguy was one of the leaders of the operation to free the hostages at Uganda's Entebbe airport. In 1981, when Israeli aircraft bombed the nuclear research center near Baghdad, he held the post of chief of Israeli military intelligence. Today Saguy is a member of the parliamentary commission for foreign affairs and defense. It was in parliament that our meeting took place.

[IZVESTIYA] General, the coalition forces have defeated your worst enemy. Does this bring you satisfaction, particularly considering that Israel luckily suffered almost not at all from the war?

[Saguy] I cannot say that Israel feels any satisfaction that someone has been brought down and that someone is being beaten. We would have been perfectly happy if Saddam Husayn had said to us: Let us live in peace. Of course, we are grateful to the United States, but it was not fighting for Israel. It was defending its own economic interests, the interests of West Europe and the Far Eastern countries. It was struggling for the freedom of an occupied Arab land. It was not doing that for our sake. We asked the United States for aid to protect our people from the missiles. If we had been drawn into the conflict that would have led to undesirable consequences for the unity of the coalition.

Show me just one nation of people which has spent 40 days in a room sealed against a possible chemical attack with gas masks on their faces. God was evidently on our side: The total damage from the firing of the "Scuds" was indeed insignificant.

[IZVESTIYA] To all appearances, however, this sorry story has already ended....

[Saguy] I do not know. Even if a firm agreement is reached now on a cease-fire, Saddam Husayn remains in power. The cease-fire means a moratorium on attacks against Iraq. Saddam Husayn may say: Our war over Kuwait has ended, but we have another enemy—Israel—and we shall continue to fire missiles on it.

[IZVESTIYA] Do you seriously believe that?

[Saguy] How else can one treat the Iraqi dictator? A few days ago he was saying his soldiers would fight to the last round of ammunition. Two days later he was leaving them to their fate. How can one believe a single word this man says?

[IZVESTIYA] You do not rule out the possibility that Israel may deliver a retaliatory strike?

[Saguy] What if one more "Scud" falls on our ground when the war has already ended? We will have to take steps; after all, the direct responsibility of any government is to defend its citizens.

Yes, Saddam has lost; but he has lost only the first round. Of course we can say: OK, the war has ended, the aim has been achieved, Kuwait is free. Saddam remains, however. Two-thirds or half his army is in Iraq. Who will give a guarantee that in two or three years he will not again challenge one of his neighbors on the battlefield?

[IZVESTIYA] So you would prefer the coalition forces to have continued the offensive against Baghdad instead of a cease-fire?

[Saguy] I think they are pinning their hopes on the Iraqi people replacing the authorities and establishing any other order as long as it is not Saddam's.

[IZVESTIYA] Do you believe that a postwar settlement should include a restriction on arms for all states of the Near East and an embargo on outside arms deliveries to them?

[Saguy] How many tanks do you want each country to have left? Let us say that you say 1,000. That is 1,000 for Syria, 1,000 for Iraq, and 1,000 for Jordan. In that case we would have to have 3,000 because we are threatened by each of these countries.

An arms limitation can be achieved only through the signing of bilateral peace treaties. Israel will be only too glad to reduce its arms and its defense appropriations if others do the same. I personally have no great certainty that an arms embargo would be strictly fulfilled.

[IZVESTIYA] Will Israel take any steps after the war to resolve the Palestinian problem?

[Saguy] The Palestinian problem is not the main problem for us. The most alarming thing for us is that a small country with a population of 4.5 million has been constantly obliged to be concerned for its survival as an independent state. Who presents an outside threat to us? Syria, Iraq, and Jordan.

The Palestinian problem can only be resolved by normalizing relations with these countries. For that it is necessary to fulfill two conditions. Let all Arab countries recognize the Jewish state's right to exist and display the readiness to sit down with us at the conference table to sign peace treaties. After that the Palestinian problem will be put on the agenda and will also be resolved as a result of bilateral contacts between Israel and these states.

[IZVESTIYA] You speak of the threat to Israel, but your neighbors also have grounds for asserting that they are threatened by Israel. Surely this can be said by Syria, from whom you have seized the Golan Heights?

[Saguy] Then let it sit at the conference table with us and we will discuss everything. That is the main condition for a settlement of the Near East conflict. Of course, the Palestinian problem is a constant headache for us but the conflict with the Palestinians does not threaten Israel's existence. We can live with the Palestinians in this situation for centuries to come.

[IZVESTIYA] Proceeding from this premise, you are depriving an entire people of the right to self-determination, to the building of their own state.

[Saguy] You are doing the same with regard to your Baltic republics. Yet here the situation is even more complex. The Palestinians never had their own state, they simply lived on this land alongside the Jews.

[IZVESTIYA] As a former military man, you think primarily of combat operations, but by delaying the solution of the Palestinian problem....

[Saguy] We are not delaying the solution of the Palestinian problem. I am saying that the key to its solution is the signing of peace treaties with our neighbors. After all, the several thousand Syrian tanks are a reality and the several hundred aircraft are also a reality.

[IZVESTIYA] Why does Israel not approve of the idea of holding an international conference on the Near East?

[Saguy] Because we know what criteria are used or at least were used previously by the USSR and the West European countries. They want above all an independent Palestinian state, and they leave the remaining problems to our discretion. We are categorically opposed to this way of putting the question.

[IZVESTIYA] Returning to the Palestinian problem: During the three years of the intifada 929 Palestinians have been killed.

[Saguy] I do not know who gave you these figures; you must recheck them. According to our figures 349 Palestinians have been killed by the Palestinians themselves, who suspected them of collaborating with the authorities. Over the years of the intifada the number of victims has not exceeded 457.

[IZVESTIYA] Checking the figures is beyond our possibilities. Even if we take the figure you suggest it in any case shows that your soldiers are using not only plastic bullets but also live ones. Does that not alarm you?

[Saguy] We have the most humane army in the world. Incidentally, plastic bullets were invented in Israel and that was done to avoid killing people.

[IZVESTIYA] After all there are numerous testimonies to the fact that soldiers here are using live ammunition and are killing children at a distance of 200-300 meters, when it is perfectly clear that the children could not have stoned the military patrols.

[Saguy] You are also shooting people in the Caucasus republics. I do not believe we have anything to be ashamed of or anything to hide.

[IZVESTIYA] In Ulster there has been a similar situation for many years, but there is not the same number of casualties there. It seems to us that Israel is relying on force and not on political means in the conflict with the Palestinians.

[Saguy] Our reaction is adequate to the threat. Have you counted the number of soldiers crippled by Molotov cocktails, blown up by mines, or killed by shots fired from corners?

[IZVESTIYA] The war in the Gulf is ending. Will the postwar world be stabler? Or does it seem to you that extremism is gathering strength in the Near East?

[Saguy] Extremism has nothing in common with war. Arab or Muslim fundamentalism is gathering strength in this region and was basically generated by the Iranian revolution. Now religious trends are strengthening in many countries, but Islamic fundamentalism is dangerous in that it drives from its environs all strangers—Christians, Orthodox, Jews....

[IZVESTIYA] We have in mind not only religious but also political extremism. In our opinion that also exists in Israel. How else can one describe the appointment to the cabinet of ministers of the retired General Zeevi, who openly advocates the idea of resettling all Palestinians in Jordan?

[Saguy] What influence can one man exert on a cabinet of more than 20 politicians? We have a coalition in parliament. To rely on the maximum majority of votes, the government has to include people with different views. That does not mean that Israel approves the policy preached by Zeevi.

Afghanistan's Najibullah on Relations, Trade

PM0403092791 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 28 Feb 91 First Edition p 5

[Report on interview with Afghanistan President Najibullah by special correspondent P. Timofeyev in Kabul; date not given: "Less Politics, More Trade: Soviet-Afghan Treaty on Establishing Friendly Relations Is 70 Years Old Today"]

[Text] Kabul-Moscow—The upcoming meeting with the president was known about beforehand. Only the place and time that the president had fixed for the interview with Soviet journalists in Kabul were not reported. It was in the interests of security, they explained to us. The mujahidin who continue to subject the city to rocket attacks would give a lot to find out Najibullah's schedule: They informed us of the meeting only half an hour beforehand.

After a thorough document check we pass through the outer security cordon around the presidential palace's complex of buildings, then the second and third; behind that is an antitank ditch and infantry armored vehicles bristling with machine-gun barrels. The officer escorting us flings open the door in a continuous green fence. Before us is one of the residencies of the Republic's president.

In the middle of an ancient, beautifully tended park is a small, modern two-story villa. We are met at the threshold by evidently the most loyal guard, the last bastion of security—the president's lovely gray lapdog. Najibullah comes down from the first floor, where he lives with his wife and three daughters, and shakes us firmly by the hand.

Before the interview starts glasses of traditional Afghan green tea and a dish of raisins and almonds is put on the table. The two dates which are widely celebrated in Afghanistan serve as the reason for our meeting. They are the second anniversary of the Soviet troop withdrawal or, as they say here, the second anniversary of the autonomous defense of the Republic, and the 70th anniversary on 28 February of the signing of the Treaty on Friendship and Cooperation Between Afghanistan and the Soviet Union.

In the president's view, the need arises for a new look at this treaty in light of the policy of national reconciliation being pursued in Afghanistan. The point is to move away from the excessive politicization of relations and to impart a mutually advantageous nature to our cooperation.

Over the past 70 years good-neighborly relations and relations of friendship between Afghanistan and the Soviet Union have been maintained throughout the most diverse regimes, including the reigns of both the king and President Daud. These relations have deep historical roots, and there is every opportunity to further reinforce Afghan-Soviet cooperation in Afghanistan today.

The presence in Afghanistan of very rich deposits of copper, iron ore, barites, and other economic minerals and the opportunity to jointly exploit these deposits could bring enormous benefit to both sides. It promises to be fruitful cooperation in the sphere of electric power generation, the creation of modern enterprises for stock raising, and the production and export of high-quality cotton.

As of today individual Afghan entrepreneurs are ready to invest national capital in the Soviet economy to the tune of tens of millions of dollars.

Concerning the question of the continuing combat operations in Afghanistan, the president noted that, in his view, it is now relatively calm in the country, except in some provinces bordering Pakistan. Last year alone 300,000 refugees returned to the country and over 140,000 mujahidin laid down their arms and stopped the war against the government. The main roads along which all essential transportation is carried out have been opened. The blockade of major cities, which was one of the opposition's aims, has been lifted.

Concerning the question of the Soviet Union's economic aid to Afghanistan and the calls to end this aid which are so often heard in our country, the president noted that the question of continuing aid to Afghanistan was recently discussed in detail in the USSR Supreme Soviet International Affairs Committee and Defense and State Security Committee. It was decided not only to maintain last year's level but also to seek opportunities to increase this aid. Afghanistan welcomes this decision and goodwill from the Soviet Union.

We could not avoid the topic of the Persian Gulf conflict in our questions. The people of Afghanistan, the president said, and our government cannot remain indifferent to this war, which daily claims more victims from among the region's Muslim people. Najibullah said that the war only complicates the conflict. It is essential to stop the further escalation of the bloodshed. The Soviet Union's diplomacy is being closely followed in Afghanistan and it is thought that the USSR is now virtually the only country capable of decisively intervening in the conflict and persuading the sides to resolve the dispute by peaceful means, although the chances of this happening are dwindling. The ground battles that have started are straining the situation to the limit, and if mass destruction weapons are used in the war it will end in a gigantic catastrophe for all the world's peoples.

Concerning the question of Soviet military supplies to Afghanistan, Najibullah said that the republic cannot yet do without them. The Government of the Republic of Afghanistan is prepared to agree to the ending of military supplies only if a total cease-fire is declared in Afghanistan and guarantees of its permanence are given.

Neither could we avoid the question of Soviet prisoners of war being held by the Afghan opposition. The president gave his assurance that his government is making every possible effort to get them released. We are not leaving unanswered, Najibullah said, a single proposal on the release of Soviet prisoners of war. A large number of them are located in Afghan territory controlled by detachments of the armed opposition. The government and the relevant services are seeking channels for establishing contact with these groupings and are conducting a dialogue with them.

Our interview time ran out. We say good-bye and leave the hospitable residence via the park's deserted avenue. It seems that nothing can disturb the city's Sunday silence, but suddenly two rumbling bangs ring out. It means that the rocket bombardment of Kabul has started again from the surrounding hills, that in a few seconds shells will explode in the city streets, that blood will once again be spilled.... The war in Afghanistan continues....

Israeli Consul General on Soviet Ties, Mideast

LD0103225291 Moscow World Service in English 1210 GMT 1 Mar 91

[Remarks attributed to Arye Levin, Israeli consul general in Moscow, date not given—read by announcer]

[Text] One can regard as something that goes without saying the desire of the Soviet Union to play its role along with other great powers in respect to the Middle East, says the Israeli diplomat. We proceed from the assumption that a Middle East settlement covers not only a the Arab-Israeli crisis. A large number of problems awaiting their solution have accumulated in the region. That's shown by the military conflict over Kuwait.

The problems are wide-ranging. They include the relationships between Arab countries, distribution of incomes from oil, and ethnic and religious problems. As for Israel, we'll be naturally glad if the Soviet Union, with its influence on some Arab countries, can help solve the problems. There are enough reasons for the Soviet Union to take part in the process of a Middle East peaceful settlement.

I must note, however, says Arye Levin, that the Soviet Union does not have diplomatic relations with Israel. At the same time it has such relations with the PLO, which we regard as a terrorist organization that doesn't represent a country. This is one principal difficulty in our relations.

Proceeding from the topic of our conversation, I'd like to emphasize that to have large-scale regional talks it's first necessary to have normal relations between all the participants. The 40 years since the formation of Israel, for which the Soviet Union voted also in the past, have been obviously dominated by tension in our relations. Today both sides are trying to ease it, but the path hasn't been fully covered yet. It's necessary to overcome the pile-up of negative tendencies in the public opinion of the Soviet Union towards Israel. I hope that the Soviet Government is thinking about this, that the relations between our two countries will be settled before the beginning of a joint search for ways to solve the problems of security in our region.

Sub-Saharan Africa

Conjecture on South Africa Contacts Criticized

PM0103171391 Moscow RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA in Russian 2 Mar 91 p 3

[Aleksandr Oskin report: "Rumors Flying; If Only They Can Tackle Us"]

[Text]

BBC

On Wednesday the Republic of South Africa [RSA] and the USSR reached an agreement on establishing official contacts.

Moscow is mainly interested in developing trade ties with the RSA. But the RSA has already indicated that it would like to establish full diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union without delay. The main obstacle will be removed with the abolition of apartheid once and for all, which is due to happen soon.

However, this will undoubtedly cause discontent among the leaders of the ANC [African National Congress], who are still trying to persuade the world that sanctions against Pretoria should be maintained.

RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA Report

We asked the USSR Foreign Ministry to comment on this fairly sensational news. We were given exhaustive explanations in the Southwest Africa Department.

It is naturally not a question of establishing diplomatic or consular relations between our countries. There has only been some broadening of contacts recorded. Under an accord with the Austrian Government sections will be set up within Austria's embassies in Pretoria and Moscow representing the interests of the USSR and the RSA. The BBC's assumption of "inevitable discontent" among ANC leaders is, to put it mildly, an exaggeration. The opening of the interests sections was agreed on in advance with the ANC.

V. Churkin, chief of the USSR Foreign Ministry Information Directorate, told Soviet and foreign journalists at a routine briefing that the opening of the interests section does not mean that we are deviating from our basic policy with respect to the RSA. The USSR consistently and firmly condemns apartheid and backs forces advocating its elimination.

I would only like to add to this that the various kinds of conjecture and speculation as regards the subject of developing USSR-RSA relations which have suddenly become "fashionable" obviously aim to discredit the Soviet foreign policy course and damage our traditionally good relations with Africa's antiracist organizations and movements.

Report on New Front in Ethiopian Fighting Viewed

EA0203183491 Moscow International Service in Amharic 1500 GMT 1 Mar 91

[Text] According to the ETHIOPIAN NEWS AGENCY, the Eritrean People's Liberation Front [EPLF] has opened a new front south of the port of Mitsiwa. If this Addis Ababa government statement is true, then the EPLF combatants' aim is to cut off the port of Aseb from the central part of the country or if possible to seize it. Then, if the plan is fulfilled, Ethiopia will have no access to the port, hence it will have problems receiving imports. Then the whole of the northern part of the country will be under the control of the weyane [Tigray People's Liberation Front—TPLF] group. The strategy of the EPLF and its collaborator the TPLF could then be to control the northern part of Ethiopia.

The various organizations are participating in the current fighting, which opened from different directions. The Oromo Liberation Front is operating in southwestern Ethiopia. The organizations are claiming many victories. If these are true, then it is the result of their coordination. According to their claims, they have seized the towns of Bahir Dar, Adis Zemen, and Werota. These towns are on roads linking Addis Ababa to the rest of the northern part of Ethiopia.

The Ethiopian Government has not confirmed the fall of these towns. The absence of the usual statements of victories scored by the government, however, reveals much. The other tangible evidence is the recent meeting of the State Council, and its statement that the country has never encountered such danger before. This statement is not limited only to the military field. Never in history has Ethiopia faced such problems which are leading to the disintegration of the country. Most of Eritrea and Tigray are under the control of the organizations, and hence the claim of Ethiopia, that these places belong to her is only words.

No one can predict what will happen in the near future. To tell the truth, partition would not benefit Ethiopia or the world at large. The current problems could be more severe if countries are formed in the Horn of Africa which cannot help themselves economically and, moreover, if enemy countries are formed. As is clear to everybody, the stand of the Addis Ababa Government is to safeguard the national unity of the country, and it is a stand which needs support. But unity cannot be safeguarded through the barrel of a gun and force. Civil war is rooted in Ethiopia and with the continuation of the civil war, Ethiopia's existence has become endangered.

If the opposition groups care more about the security of their people than about their personal greed, this could be achieved through dialogue. For example, some of the EPLF leaders say that if the people's rights could be known through a referendum, they are ready for a referendum. The TPLF for its part, has its own peace plan. Its program calls for a cease-fire in Ethiopia and the immediate establishment of an interim government, which would be formed with the participation of all the opposition groups. The TPLF then calls for nationwide elections, with the participation of all parties. The Addis Ababa government has refused to accept all these ideas.

Latest Developments in South Africa Viewed

PM0103161791 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 27 Feb 91 Union Edition p 5

["Political Observer's Opinion" by Vitaliy Kobysh: "South Africa: Changes"]

[Text] The war in the Persian Gulf has monopolized the attention of world public opinion. Important events and serious changes—albeit, of course, not on such a global scale or of such explosive drama as in a region where a large war is being waged—are nevertheless taking place in other regions. One such is South Africa, mere mention of which until quite recently induced a sense of horror in some and complete despair in others. New, fresh winds have blown not just in Europe and the Asia-Pacific region, they have blown there too. Their breath indeed could be detected many years back, when, after sustaining considerable casualties in fighting in southern Angola, South Africa "faltered" and agreed to talks. Talks on a political settlement in Southwest Africa were conducted jointly with Angola and Cuba through the mediation of the USSR and the United States, and in December 1988 were crowned by the signing of an agreement that unlocked many problems.

The agreement was the fruit of the commonsense and sense of realism displayed by all parties. The fact that this commonsense and realism was demonstrated by the leaders of South Africa was, it seems, especially important.

It is hardly worth saying that this did not happen overnight, but was the result of a long, anguished, and bloody struggle. Something else is obvious too: We are talking about not just this one agreement, but about substantial shifts in the configuration of political forces in South Africa and changes in the public mind. Plus the fact that the major idea of our time—that force is impotent and the quest for mutually acceptable, peaceful solutions based on goodwill is omnipotent—now dominates in this apparently godforsaken country. A process of reexamining positions and seeking national accord has started up in various groups and in social and ethnic strata of the population of South Africa. Breaking down racial and social barriers, this process is visibly gathering momentum.

I have to admit that, for all the decades-long attention we gave to the destructive confrontation between the indigenous "black" population of South Africa and the champions of apartheid, events almost caught us unawares. Almost, because what was happening seemed inconceivable and hope was fading that the hostile sides—and first and foremost the "whites" who had usurped power—would sooner or later have to start a search for reconciliation. Let us not now consider what decided the issue: The heroism of the anti-apartheid fighters or a sense of realism and even courage by representatives of the ruling minority like President Frederik de Klerk and Foreign Minister Roelof Frederik Botha. The main point is that progress has been made in the right direction, which became clear when Nelson Mandela was freed from long imprisonment. What happened in the South African parliament last week, in particular, confirmed the seriousness and depth of the process under way. Speaking from its rostrum, Deputy Foreign Minister L. Wessels made a public apology to the nonwhite population of the country for apartheid and the consequences of the policy of racial discrimination. In the context of the events taking place, that is no mean event.

The recent meeting at the military airfield in Capetown between delegations of the South African Government and the African National Congress [ANC] was without any doubt of crucial importance for the outcome of the process under way. I have before me the documents adopted at that meeting, which have not yet been translated into Russian. Their basic thrust is the removal of barriers to the start of talks on South Africa's future constitutional structure. The ANC assumes a commitment not to resort to force or the use of weapons and recognizes the laws operating in the country. For its part, the South African government undertakes to speed up the release of political prisoners and the return of refugees.

"An important step toward democracy and peace has been taken"—this is how both the ANC leadership and the South African Government assess the accord.

I would like to make two comments in this regard.

First, it is difficult to overestimate the importance of the events taking place in South Africa. One should not, however, give way to euphoria, that would be premature. A difficult struggle to implement the agreements that have been achieved still lies ahead. They are being furiously and violently opposed by extremists on both sides—left and right.

Second, the significance of what is happening in South Africa goes beyond the boundaries of just that country. It sounds strange, but it is a fact that South Africa is now setting an example of how the most complex problems can be tackled through talks based on goodwill.

Now, for matters that already officially and directly concerns our country, as it were. A report was published in Vienna 26 February that an agreement to set up a USSR interest section in the Austrian Embassy in Pretoria and a South African interest section in the Austrian Embassy in Moscow had been reached as a result of Soviet-South African-Austrian talks. In the absence of diplomatic and consular relations, day-to-day work will be conducted and contacts maintained between the two countries through these sections. The talks were conducted on the Soviet Union's part by V.N. Kazimirov, chief of the USSR Foreign Ministry Administration for African Countries.

An important step has been taken, and new opportunities are being created for further progress by the USSR and South Africa toward normal relations. This news can be unambiguously regarded as good.

East Europe

Last Soviet Missiles Leave Hungary

PM0403133991 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 2 Mar 91 First Edition p 1

["News Service" report under general heading: "Army and Navy"]

[Text]

Last Soviet Missiles Leave Hungary

Colonel N. Botov, commander of an anti-aircraft missile unit, and F. Schmidt, mayor of the Hungarian city of Mor, shook hands for a long time, patted each other on the shoulder, and talked animatedly about something. Incidentally, they were not alone. All Soviet missile men and staff officers of the Southern Group of Forces bid a friendly farewell to local inhabitants and representatives of the Hungarian Army, exchanging souvenirs and badges.

This event took place at the Bodajk railroad station prior to the departure of a Soviet military train carrying the last missiles.

Yazov Greets Bulgarian Counterpart on Holiday

PM0403140791 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 2 Mar 91 First Edition p 1

[Greetings message from USSR Defense Minister D.T. Yazov to Bulgarian Defense Minister Yordan Mutafchiev on occasion of Bulgarian National Day; date not given]

[Text] To Colonel General Yordan Mutafchiev, defense minister of the Bulgarian Republic:

On behalf of the Soviet Armed Forces and myself personally I congratulate you and all Bulgarian servicemen on your National Day—the liberation of Bulgaria from the Ottoman yoke.

We express confidence that the consistent strengthening and further improvement of friendly ties and mutually advantageous cooperation with the Bulgarian People's Army will continue to serve the interests of the Soviet and the Bulgarian peoples and the cause of international stability in Europe and throughout the world.

[Signed] Marshal of the Soviet Union D.T. Yazov, USSR defense minister

West Europe

Treaty Outlining Ties With Germany Detailed

LD0403112191 Moscow TASS in English 1109 GMT 4 Mar 91

[By TASS diplomatic correspondent]

[Text] Moscow March 4 TASS—A package of documents regulating Soviet-German relations to be ratified by the Soviet parliament will be of great importance for future relations between the USSR and Germany, Yuliy Kvitsinskiy, USSR deputy foreign minister, told TASS.

He said these documents regulate relations between the Soviet Union and Germany.

Russia's and later the Soviet Union's relations with Germans have always been of cardinal importance for the situation in Europe and outside it, Kvitsinskiy said.

The signing of a treaty on a final settlement regarding Germany, as well as a treaty on good-neighbourlinees, partnership and cooperation will be of historic importance if both sides express the wish to act in the spirit of these accords.

Kvitsinskiy said that the documents signed do not damage the Soviet Union's security. Kvitsinskiy noted that in view of certain provisions of a large-scale Soviet-German treaty, it is more than just a non-aggression pact. The question of frontiers has been solved in the treaty in a clear-cut political and juridical form.

The united Germany comprises the territories of the FRG and the GDR. The question of the Kaliningrad region as a composite part of the Soviet territory is thus ultimately resolved.

Germany has committed itself not to have nuclear, chemical or bacteriological weapons. Its army will be cut to 370,000 servicemen, which is half the number of troops the FRG and the GDR had together.

Special military status had been established for five eastern lands of the FRG (there will be no foreign troops nor nuclear delivery vehicles in those regions). Germans pledged themselves to conduct peace policies, to refrain from the use of any kind of weapons, except in self-defence, and never to be the first to use armed forces.

Not all NATO members approved of the provisions of the treaty. There was an undercurrent of resistance at the concluding stage. However, Germans remained honest and persistent. They complied with all the provisions that the president of the USSR and the German chancellor agreed upon in the Northern Caucasus in summer 1990.

Besides that, it should be noted that the Paris agreements on the reductions of arms and armed forces in Europe and on confidence- building measures have an intrinsic link, and that 22 countries, members of NATO and of the Warsaw Treaty Organisation, no longer view one another as adversaries, Kvitsinskiy said.

Comments on German Compensation

LD2803230491 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1800 GMT 28 Feb 91

[Report by correspondent V. Kondratyev in Bonn, from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Excerpts] [Announcer] In Bonn, conversations between USSR Deputy Foreign Minister, Yuliy Kvitsinskiy, and FRG foreign ministry state secretary, Dieter Kastrup, have taken place last year when the package of agreements and treaties on the German settlement was worked out and signed, it seemed that everything was provided for. However, an important problem remained unresolved, although it was discussed—compensation for Soviet citizens who suffered Nazi persecution during the war. [passage omitted]

[Kondratyev] So what will happen as regards compensation? Has the train already left? It is possible to say with confidence, no? What did the two sides agree on?

[Kvitsinskiy] The German side confirmed its readiness to keep to the schedule and develop an appropriate settlement with us which will be comparable in content and design to those settlements which the FRG had on this issue with around a dozen countries, including France, Greece, Luxembourg.

[Kondratyev] As far as I know, a similar question arose in Germany's relations with Poland, but at that time it was not possible to solve this question positively in the Polish side's favor. What is causing the Germans to meet us on this question now?

[Kvitsinskiy] I know that our Polish neighbors are continuing talks on these issues, however, no decision has yet been announced, and I do not know how far it has gone. As far as we are concerned then, the conclusion of this settlement package with the united Germany played a role, and in the first place the conclusion of the treaty, the treaty we call the big treaty, that is the treaty on goodneighborliness, cooperation and partnership.

[Kondratyev] The most important thing has been done. An agreement in principle has been achieved. In March, official talks will take place, and compensation will be paid out to those who have the right to it.

Moiseyev Cited on Troop Withdrawal From Germany

LD0103141991 Moscow TASS in English 1136 GMT 1 Mar 91

[BY TASS correspondent Oleg Moskovskiy]

[Text] Moscow March 1 TASS—"The treaty between the Soviet Union and the Federal Republic of Germany on terms for a temporary stay and systematic withdrawal of Soviet troops from German territory, in a package with other accords, was a new step in a final settlement of relations with Germany," General of the Army Mikhail Moiseyev, chief of the Soviet Armed Forces' General Staff, told TASS today on the eve of his participation in the work of the Soviet parliament Committee for Defence and State Security.

The committee is to discuss the item concerning terms for the temporary stay and systematic withdrawal of Soviet troops from German territory.

The treaty is designed "to maintain well-wishing relations between the population, various states and public organisations of Germany and Soviet troops on a "reciprocal basis and to resolve on a fair basis all arising contentious issues and provide ample opportunities for all activities connected with the stay and withdrawal of our troops," Moiseyev said.

"The position of the victor country gave us a moral right to put our conditions more toughly. But we did not follow that path. [words indistinct] the already adopted political decision to withdraw troops before the end of 1994 and taking into account the established inter-state relations," Moiseyev emphasised.

The treaty-determined time-span for the withdrawal of the Western Group of troops from Germany by the end of 1994 put the Soviet Defence Ministry into a rigid framework of planning for the withdrawal of troops, the removal of the stocks of material and technical means and their storing on Soviet territory and placed the troops of the Western Group confronted the troops of the western group with the fact of their stay and activities on German territory," Moiseyev said.

A plan and a time-table for the withdrawal of troops of the Western Group were coordinated and handed over to the German side at the end of December 1990, as provided for by the treaty, Moiseyev said.

In all, within the four years, about 500,000 servicemen, 114,000 units of hardware and 1.5 million tonnes of stocks of material and technical means are to be withdrawn, the general said. This will require more than 11,000 trains and up to 1,130 shipping runs, he added.

Considering the current situation and possibilities for the use of various types of transport, a yearly breakdown of the planned troop withdrawal percentage is as follows: 25-30 per cent in 1991, 30 per cent in 1992, 30 per cent in 1993, and 10-15 per cent in 1994, General Moiseyev said.

General Scores German Stance on Army Deserters

LD0403102591 Moscow TASS in English 0955 GMT 4 Mar 91

[By TASS correspondent Oleg Moskovskiy]

[Text] Moscow March 4 TASS—"The problem of desertion of Soviet servicemen and their subsequent escape to the FRG, which appeared after the reunification of Germany, has become one of the most difficult issues today", spokesman for the Soviet General Staff Major-General Vladimir Zhurbenko told TASS.

"In violation of the USSR-FRG agreement of October 12, 1990 'on the terms of the Soviet troops temporary stay on FRG territory and their subsequent withdrawal', competent German authorities fail to inform the Soviet side about cases when they happen to detain servicemen from the Western Group of Soviet Troops," Zhurbenko said.

According to the general, there are now 221 men on FRG territory, who have deserted from the Soviet Western Group of Troops. They include 151 servicemen (35 officers), as well as 53 family members and 17 civilian employeees from the Soviet Army.

Zhurbenko believes that in violation of the agreement on legal assistance and cooperation between corresponding Soviet and German bodies, such contacts have not been sufficiently well organised, mainly through the fault of the German side.

"For instance," Zhurbenko noted, "representative of the Soviet Government, responsible for the temporary stay and withdrawal of Soviet troops from the FRG, as well as the Western Army Group's military procecutor, have repeatedly called on various bodies of the Federal Government to extradite the deserters. The Soviet Foreign Ministry has transmitted a note, demanding the extradition of former regiment commander Lieutenant-Colonel Mikhail Kolesnikov, who stole secret ammuniton and fled to the FRG together with his family. However, the German side is dragging out, at all levels, the settlement of this question, referring to some provisions of its legislation."

"The fact that the important problem of extraditing Soviet citizens, who have violated the law, is being ignored, tends to darken relations between our two countries and may produce further undesirable consequences," Zhurbenko said.

Falin Meets With German PDS Board Members

PM2802102291 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Feb 91 Second Edition p 6

[Unattributed TASS report under the general heading "Official Announcements"]

[Text] V.M. Falin, CPSU Central Committee secretary and director of the CPSU Central Committee International Department, met 26 February with J. Willerding, member of the Presidium of the FRG Party of Democratic Socialism Board, and H. Scholz, member of the Party of Democratic Socialism board.

The talks took place in a spirit of party comradeship, with the participants exchanging information on the basic aims of their parties' activities.

UK Prime Minister's Moscow Agenda Outlined

PM0403162191 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 5 Mar 91 Union Edition p 4

[Article by diplomatic correspondent M. Yusin: "What Will Be Discussed at the Talks in Moscow"]

[Text] British Prime Minister John Major flew into Moscow on a brief working visit late in the evening of 4 March. This is the first trip to our country by the new British head of government, who replaced Margaret Thatcher in this post three months ago. In addition, Major is the first Western leader to visit the Soviet Union since the end of the war in the Persian Gulf.

People both in Moscow (as conversations with Foreign Ministry staffers have shown) and in London (according to Western newspapers and agencies) are convinced that the situation in the Persian Gulf will be the dominant topic in Major's talks with the Soviet leaders. It is important for the anti-Iraq coalition (who John Major will represent to some extent in Moscow) to clear up the USSR's position and intentions and to form a clear idea of how the Soviet leaders look on the postwar setup in the region.

Commenting on Major's trip, British diplomats single out several questions on which the prime minister would like to concentrate attention: the maintenance of sanctions against Iraq, particularly in the military sphere (London is uncompromising on this), and the fate of the prisoners of war held by Baghdad (Major hopes that our country is using its influence over Saddam Husayn for their speedy release).

The situation in the Baltic region will hardly be overlooked. Among the major European states Britain comes out most consistently in support of the Baltic republics' independence. On the morning of 5 March Major meets with representatives of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia at the British Embassy. This measure is outside the framework of the official program for the visit, the Foreign Ministry has specified.

Questions of bilateral relations and also EC financial assistance for the USSR will certainly be touched on in the talks with the Soviet leaders. According to an "informed source" in the British leadership, cited by AFP's London correspondent, Major will appeal to Gorbachev to continue the reforms aimed at developing a market economy—which will make it possible to attract foreign investments. "The prime minister may give a guarantee that London will influence its EC partners with a view to securing the resumption of economic aid to the USSR, which was suspended after the bloody events in Vilnius and Riga," the agency writes, citing the same source.

We have been told at the USSR Foreign Ministry that Major will spend less than 24 hours in Moscow. The program of the visit includes talks with President Gorbachev, which will begin in the Kremlin at approximately 1100 on 5 March, a meeting with Prime Minister Pavlov (to all appearances, it will be devoted mainly to economic questions), and one with Defense Minister Yazov. The British prime minister will also meet, this time "privately," with former Soviet Foreign Minister Shevardnadze. His flight from Moscow is scheduled for 2030.

UK's Major Cited on Bilateral Ties, Gulf War

PM0103121791 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 1 Mar 91 Union Edition p 6

[Report on interview with British Prime Minister John Major by A. Krivopalov in London; date not given: "J. Major: There Is Every Reason To Strengthen Peace in Europe. Head of British Government Answers IZVESTIYA's Questions"]

[Excerpt] London—"Times are difficult right now, but I would very much like my previously planned visit to Moscow to remain part of my schedule."

That was how Britain's prime minister, John Major, began his conversation in his official government residence at No. 10 Downing Street with a group of Soviet journalists accredited to London.

The meeting took place in a room overlooking the internal courtyard, where at the beginning of February a rocket launched by terrorists exploded. There were still two holes in the ceiling—traces of fragments of glass or metal. The head of government did not say a word about the attack. However, when we asked Major how his life had changed after taking on the post of prime minister, he answered quietly: "The biggest inconvenience is the inevitable security measures that quite palpably harm my private and family life."

"I have not yet met Mr. Gorbachev in person," the head of the British Cabinet said. "We had a lengthy telephone conversation last Saturday morning. It is perhaps the first time in the modern world of diplomacy that an acquaintanceship has started up over the telephone. The conversation went very well, although it touched on the difficult problem of the Persian Gulf region. I do not think there will be any difficulty continuing the very good relations that developed between Mr. Gorbachev and Mrs. Thatcher."

In Major's opinion, the favorable changes in Soviet-British ties over the last few years were due to these two state leaders and to perestroyka, which he hopes will be preserved.

"They did not always agree," the prime minister noted, "they acknowledged their differences, they knew one another and understood why they took a different view of certain problems."

The head of the British Government thinks that these summit meetings were notable for the direct and frank way in which each set out their viewpoint. The quality of these contacts was determined by the fact that both interlocutors saw one another as individuals.

Continuing to develop this theme, Major stressed that it is his profound conviction that regular meetings between our two countries' leaders lie ahead. He said that he hopes that Gorbachev will come to London in the near future.

The prime minister mentioned the significance of the political changes in the USSR, which have met with a positive response throughout the world, and noted particularly that, in his view, economic changes will take more time. "Very unpopular decisions have to be adopted and maintained for a long period before switching from a command economy to a free market where everything is determined by price, consumer demand, and efficiency," he said. According to Major, "political stability is needed" to implement economic reform.

I asked the prime minister how he sees the system of European security after the military structure of the Warsaw Treaty Organization disappears.

"The Warsaw Treaty Organization may not exist, but there is still the Soviet Union, which has always held the dominant position in the Warsaw Pact. Of course, if we are talking about European security, the situation has changed dramatically—that is indeed how things stand, I believe—and glasnost has to a great extent promoted these changes. Both sides deserve credit. Thanks to NATO and the USSR the situation as regards safeguarding security has changed. It has changed favorably. I think that this will also be the situation in the future provided that the USSR president continues to maintain close contacts with the U.S. President and other Western leaders."

The prime minister is convinced that neither the Soviet Union nor the West wants conflict. He believes there is every basis to strengthen peace in Europe. "We can achieve this. That is what I would like to discuss with Mr. Gorbachev on a regular basis."

I thought it logical and natural to raise another question here—how does Major regard the USSR's efforts to achieve a peaceful settlement of the Persian Gulf conflict?

"I believe that these efforts have been made out of a desire to help. Mr. Gorbachev was alarmed by this conflict. He wanted to find a diplomatic way out. There is no doubt in my mind that he sought to achieve this. And with good reason."

Mr. Major then substantiated the well-known position taken by Washington and London, which have insisted that Baghdad immediately agree to all Security Council resolutions concerning the Iraqi occupation of Kuwait.

"As far as I am aware," Britain's prime minister went on to say, "the discussions on this subject between Gorbachev and President Bush have been exceptionally friendly. They examined the possibility of a way out without diverging in their assessment of events. Just as my conversation with Gorbachev on Saturday morning was very friendly and constructive. So I think that it was absolutely natural for a great power like the Soviet Union to attempt to find a way of setting the conflict." [passage omitted].

French National Assembly Delegation Pays Visit

Meets With Minister Bessmertnykh

LD2602164991 Moscow TASS in English 1613 GMT 26 Feb 91

[Text] Moscow February 26 TASS—Soviet Foreign Minister Aleksandr Bessmertnykh today met Michel Vauzelle, chairman of the Foreign Affairs Commission of the French National Assembly, who is in the Soviet Union at the invitation of the International Affairs Committee of the Soviet parliament.

The sides exchanged views on the state and prospects for the development of friendly relations between the Soviet Union and France, as well as their assessment of major recent international developments.

In considering the situation in the Gulf, the Soviet minister spoke about the new phase in the conflict which could have been avoided if advantage had been taken of the real chance for a peaceful outcome. The sides discussed prospects for ending further bloodshed and shifting the conflict towards a political settlement.

The two statesmen also considered prospects for European building, including in connection with the problem of implementing the treaty on conventional arms in Europe.

French Relations Deemed 'Model'

LD2702111291 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1712 GMT 26 Feb 91

[Text] Moscow, 26 Feb (TASS)—Rafik Nishanov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of Nationalities, in the course of his meeting here today with Michel Vauzelle, chairman of the Foreign Affairs Commission of the French National Assembly who is in Moscow, referred to Soviet-French relations as a model for the parterns' cooperation.

In the course of the discussion, particular attention was focused on interethnic problems. Characterizing the Soviet leadership's stance in relation to events in the Baltic republics, R. Nishanov noted that it is essential to resolve this issue by political methods. There is no resolution on force for this and there cannot be one, he noted. The chairman of the Soviet of Nationalities informed M. Vauzelle in detail of the essence of the forthcoming referendum on the preservation of the USSR and about work on the draft union treaty. Issues of international policy were also discussed.

On the same day Michel Vauzelle had a discussion with Aleksandr Dzasikhov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet International Affairs Committee. Attention was focused on issues of all-European security and disarmament, including the problems of the Mediterranean.

There was a wide-ranging exchange of views on the development of interparliamentary links between the USSR Supreme Soviet and the French National Assembly.

Received by Lukyanov

LD2702155291 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1248 GMT 27 Feb 91

[Text] Moscow, 27 Feb (TASS)—In the Kremlin today, Anatoliy Lukyanov, chairman of the USSR Supreme

Soviet, received Michel Vauzelle, chairman of the Foreign Affairs Commission of the French National Assembly.

There was an exchange of opinions on the development of Soviet-French relations along parliamentary lines, and on a number of pressing issues concerning the international situation.

Prokofyev Receives Turkish Party Delegation

PM0103151891 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 26 Feb 91 Second Edition p 5

[Attributed TASS report under general heading "Official Announcements"]

[Text] A delegation from the Social Democratic Populist Party of Turkey, headed by E. Karakash [name as transliterated], chairman of the Istanbul organization, was in the Soviet Union between 17 and 24 February.

The delegation was received by Yu.A. Prokofyev, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of Moscow CPSU Gorkom [city committee]. Talks took place at the CPSU Central Committee Department for Relations With Sociopolitical Organizations and International Department, Leningrad CPSU Obkom [oblast committee], party organizations, and scientific institutions.

Supreme Soviet

Supreme Soviet Ratifies Germany Treaties 4 Mar

LD0403221391

[Editorial Report] Moscow Central Television Second Program Network in Russian at 1900 GMT on 4 March broadcasts a 52-minute recorded "At the USSR Supreme Soviet" program on work at the USSR Supreme Soviet session at the Kremlin in Moscow on 4 March. The program begins with a 33-minute report delivered by USSR Deputy Foreign Minister Yuliy Kvitsinskiy on the ratification of the treaties between the USSR and Germany. He notes that the Supreme Soviet's International Affairs and Defense and Security Committees have examined the treaties in detail and have recommended that they be ratified. These treaties are important and necessary, he says, noting that they were prepared in 1990 as a result of complex talks, with the involvement of the president and the foreign minister. There is no such thing as an ideal treaty, he adds, but these treaties serve the interests of the Soviet Union well. On the processes that took place in Germany in the autumn of 1989, he says there are still some people around who think they could have been stopped and that the German people could have been forced to put up with the continuing division of their country. This, however, was not the case, he says. Kvitsinskiy recalls the Versailles, Potsdam, and Yalta treaties, outlining the historical backdrop that had to be taken into consideration. The main issue here, Kvitsinskiy says, was the militarization of Germany, something that took place time and again. It is from this viewpoint that one must look at the recent events in Germany: even though the division did weaken Germany, it was, at the same time, a delayed action mine, as it were. All the time we had to insure that we did not panic or were guided by emotions. We had to go for compromise. We had to ensure that there is no conflict—but that we all emerge from this as partners and neighbors.

Kvitsinskiy goes on to review the principles of the treaties: Germany is to recognize European frontiers, renounce various types of weapons, reduce its army, insure that fascism does not recur, and so forth. These principles have had to be modified in accordance with the situation as it developed, and the USSR had to be flexible, he adds.

Kvitsinskiy continues his review of various principles of the treaty, and he also mentions the details of the November 1990 Polish-German treaty signed in Warsaw. He says the USSR can now "count on the goodwill of our German partners," as evidenced by the good-neighborliness treaty which "will stand the test of time." The German question has been "solved," he adds. After noting that the state of affairs in Europe will depend to a large extent on Soviet- FRG relations, he concludes by urging deputies to ratify the treaties.

3 of 5 Treaties Ratified

LD0403175891 Moscow TASS in English 1714 GMT 4 Mar 91

[By TASS parliamentary correspondents Ivan Ivanov and Vladimir Isachenkov]

[Text] Moscow March 4 TASS—The closed session of the Soviet parliament today ratified three out of five Soviet-German treaties concluded in September-November 1990.

These are treaties on the final settlement with respect to Germany, on good neighbourly relations, partnership and cooperation between the USSR and Germany and on the development of large-scale cooperation in the economy, industry, science and technology.

Parliament also "in principle approved" a treaty on the conditions of temporary deployment and planned withdrawal of Soviet troops from the German territory and an inter-governmental agreement on some transitional meaures.

Head of the press service of the Soviet parliament Arkadiy Maslennikov told TASS that two documents were "approved in principle" but not ratified, "since the two sides have mutual technical issues, which need to be finalised. These issues concern conditions of Soviet troops' stay in Germany and their gradual withdrawal".

It is expected that the documents will be improved by the parliamentary committee on international affairs and submitted for ratification in two weeks' time.

Later in the day, parliament also adopted a statement describing the ratification of the Soviet-German treaties as an "act of historic importance", which "opens a new epoch of lasting peace and large-scale cooperation between the Soviet and German peoples".

The statement says that the Soviet legislature "concluded that the package of treaties on the German settlement conforms to the national and state interests of the USSR".

Maslennikov said that the Soviet parliament decided to set up a parliamentary committee on the implementation of ratified documents between the USSR and Germany.

Kvitsinskiy Outlines Treaties

LD0403220391

[Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 1721 GMT on 4 March in its "Legislative Diary" program carries a seven-minute recorded report on the speech by USSR Deputy Foreign Minister Yuliy Kvitsinskiy to the USSR Supreme Soviet session debating ratification of the two-plus-four treaties with Germany.

Kvitsinskiy is heard describing the importance of the treaties with Germany. He says that all views have been attentively studied, so that the implementation of the treaties will serve Soviet interests in the best possible way.

Kvitsinskiy goes on to outline various articles of the treaties, singling out an article which says that the German Armed Forces must not exceed 370,000 men, this limit to be reached within the next three to four years. Another important issue is that of compensation to be paid to Soviet citizens who suffered during the Second World War. The FRG is to allocate 15 billion Deutsche marks to facilitate Soviet withdrawal and housing construction in the USSR, Kvitsinskiy explains; in 1991-1994 four million square meters of housing are to be built in the USSR along with four housing combines, with the capacity to produce 100,000 square meters of housing per year each.

'Historic Importance' Noted

LD0403175191 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1719 GMT 4 Mar 91

[By TASS correspondents Ivan Ivanov and Vladimir Isachenkov]

[Text] Moscow, 4 Mar (TASS)—The USSR Supreme Soviet today described the ratification of the Soviet-German treaties as "an act of historic importance that opens up a new era of lasting peace and wide-scale cooperation between the Soviet and German peoples." A statement on the ratification notes that the clauses of the treaties on the final nature of the current German borders; its renunciation of any territorial claims; and the whole sum of its military-political commitments, including the commitments not to produce or acquire nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons, are of fundamentally important significance.

The Supreme Soviet, the document goes on, proceeds from the fact that human rights will be consistently observed in a unified Germany, and, among other things, discrimination against citizens of the former GDR on political and ideological grounds will be excluded.

As a result of this, the statement points out, the Supreme Soviet has concluded that the package of treaties on a German settlement meets the USSR's national and state interests.

The statement points out that the practical commitments arising from the agreements provide for a solution to questions connected with the stay and the withdrawal of Soviet troops. The parliament has instructed the country's Cabinet of Ministers and all the corresponding departments and organizations to take the necessary measures to implement the clauses of the ratified treaties with the strict observance by the sides of the commitments arising from them.

Dzasokhov Views Treaties

LD0403233691 Moscow Central Television Second Program Network in Russian 1935 GMT 4 Mar 91

[Speech by Aleksandr Sergeyevich Dzasokhov, chairman of the Supreme Soviet International Affairs Committee, at the Supreme Soviet session in Moscow on 4 March—recorded; from the "At the USSR Supreme Soviet" program]

[Text] Esteemed members of the Supreme Soviet: Commencing the examination of the treaties concerning the German settlement, I would say that in the process of their ratification, the Soviet parliament is facing an exceptionally important and responsible task—namely to strengthen the hope of the peoples of the Soviet Union, the whole of Europe, and also of the whole world that it is only peace that will from now on emanate from the German soil. This moral legal norm, enshrined in the documents under examination, should become an imperative for the present and future Germany. Such is the will of the wartime and post-war generations of the Soviet people and mankind as a whole. Our country, the Soviet people, have a moral right to be exacting regarding the content of the treaty on the final settlement with respect to Germany and all the Soviet-German documents. It is understandable, it is easily explained, and it is timely to recall this. This summer we shall mark the 50th anniversary of the start of the Great Fatherland War and Hitlerite Germany's attack on the Soviet Union. Our country sustained sacrifices which cannot be compared with anyone's or anything, in the name of our state's independence and the liberation of the peoples of Europe. In connection with this, I would like to recall, supplementing Deputy Kvitsinskiy's very thorough report, that the Soviet Union did not set as its goal to divide Germany. It is the Western allies, not the Soviet Union, that strove for Germany to be split. It is precisely the West that advocated setting up the FRG. Right up until the end of the fifties, the Soviet Union advocated unification of Germany.

Only after the leadership of the German Democratic Republic put forward a concept of two German nations did the USSR change its position. It is also important to state that the division of Germany was a consequence of the cold war which divided the whole world and all Europe into two camps. The end of the cold war made the overcoming of this division inevitable. The post-war period could not go on forever, of course. The stay of our troops on the territory of another country, for more than 41 years, is really unprecedented in the history of our state. But analyzing retrospectively our activities and initiatives, I must say that we, of course, should have prepared earlier for the end of this stay.

The following notion has taken shape: Documents which are being examined today are of special interest in a ratification process undertaken by the Supreme Soviet. This is also proven by the fact that the International

Affairs Committee, the sittings of which were extensively attended by a large group of people's deputies, gathered three times and spent quite a number of hours with the participation of experts, international affairs specialists, economists, and political scientists representing large scientific centers dealing with international affairs. Discussions, without any exceptions, were always involved and were always open to questions. Following a deepened and all-around analysis, it was recognized that the package submitted has met the interests of the USSR in its consolidated results. A common opinion expressed advocated the ratification of the package of treaties and agreements concerning German settlement. Treaties and agreements submitted to ratification as well as other documents connected with them represent an interconnected system of international juridical obligations which basically create a new legal regime in relations between the USSR and the FRG, a normative frame for a future political structure in Europe.

This represented a distinguishing feature of the elaboration of these documents, because it took place against the backdrop of a vigorous European process, and it was important to normalize these two natural processes. The treaties and agreements submitted for ratification finally draw a line under the results of the Second World War, signifying the end of an entire period of military and political confrontation on the European continent. Naturally, each and every time and, particularly, when looking back at the past, the peoples of the Soviet Union, just as the peaceloving peoples of the planet, would like to believe in the letter and spirit of the treaties that are being adopted. At the same time, it is necessary to set oneself the goal of ensuring their full implementation. The settlement with respect to Germany was not accomplished by itself, but in the context of a different political atmosphere in Europe, a course aimed at creating new security structures within the framework of the continent. The central goal here is to set up a pan-European security system.

Adopting a decision to recommend the USSR Supreme Soviet to ratify the package of these international treaties and agreements, we also proceeded from the fact that they do not just have a political, economic, and military dimension, but that they also have a moral and psychological dimension: the emergent new atmosphere of mutual trust. All this was reflected in the course, nature, and results of the examination, because one had to take account of the most widely differing positions and viewpoints, expressed by the USSR people's deputies.

I will not now dwell upon the fundamental tenets, the outline of which is beginning to emerge thanks to the military and political aspects and bilateral relations as a result of the talks. Let me merely draw your attention to those questions which gave rise to particularly sharp discussions, namely, in the first place: As those that took part in the discussion pointed out, the documents under consideration today must not be superimposed upon the old conceptual model or the old political map of Europe. It is essential to project them onto a Europe where a fundamentally new reality is taking shape, which has come a long way from the ideas of the cold war era. The discussion of the documents in the International Affairs Committee and also the repeated discussions in the Defense and State Security Committee focused particular attention on aspects such as the state of the USSR's national security in the conditions of the altered balance of forces on the European continent and in the world as a whole, with the preservation, at this present stage, of the NATO bloc, the breakup of the Warsaw Pact and the rise in economic potential and political role of the unified Germany. All of these components provoked particularly substantial discussions.

The issue of the permanence and unchanging nature of the current European borders—very many views were also expressed on this issue, proposing an attentive attitude to the progress of implementing the points in the treaty, and to the working-out of our bilateral relations with the Eastern European states. There was also the issue of reparations and the prospects for the USSR's trade and economic relations with the lands which, prior to unification, were part of the German Democratic Republic. Talk was of finding ways of preserving and restoring the well-established trade and economic relations, including those at the level of one enterprise with another.

Further, the material and financial conditions of our group of forces' presence in Germany and the agenda and timescale for the withdrawal of the Western Group of Forces from the Federal Republic of Germany. Some very productive ideas were expressed on this matter about the necessity of setting up a special state program, with the Supreme Soviet playing the role of initiator. Compensation for people who were forcibly driven from the USSR to Germany during the war, and who were made to do forced labor, were also discussed. I must note that as regards the agenda for implementing the wishes of the deputies, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, as Comrade Kvitsinskiy's recent visit to the FRG shows, has undertaken a number of measures to see that these issues move toward practical realization.

At the same time, the speed at which the process of German settlement proceeded, a truly cosmic speed, has led, unfortunately, to lack of necessary parliamentary monitoring of the progress in the talks and in preparing the documents. Deputies devoted their justified attention to this during the examination of the documents which had been submitted.

At the same time, we came to a firm conclusion and conviction that the package of treaties and agreements on German settlement meets the state interests of the Soviet Union. In terms of prospects, they open an opportunity to significantly step up cooperation with the united Germany, including cooperation in science, technology, trade, and economy, and to develop this cooperation on a constructive basis of international law.

I must note that the entire period since the documents on Soviet-German interaction which were submitted for your consideration were signed shows the disposition of the leadership of the Federal Republic of Germany to strictly follow the provisions of the treaties signed, and to confirm the course for active political and economic cooperation with our country. This was illustrated in a very convincing way during the Persian Gulf crisis.

Finally, I must inform the Supreme Soviet that in the near future the FRG foreign minister is expected to visit the Soviet Union to turn to the content of the documents which have been mentioned again and again and to examine the prospects for their implementation in the spirit of benevolence. The International Affairs Committee has received hundreds of letters from war veterans, Soviet public figures, representatives of mass public organizations, which invariably express interest in the treaties on German settlement which are under examination. I think that we could confirm the course of the Soviet Union toward building new inter-state relations on the European contient by our attitude to ratification of these treaties.

At the same time, it would be advisable to adopt, on behalf of the Supreme Soviet, a political statement which relects the will and aspirations of the Soviet people, prior to the adoption of such responsible decisions connected with the ratification of the treaties on a German settlement.

Deputies, Pavlov Disagree on Cabinet Confirmation

PM0403150991 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 1 Mar 91 Union Edition p 1

[Report by legislative correspondents A. Stepovoy and S. Chugayev: "Law on Cabinet of Ministers Under Discussion"]

[Excerpts] Virtually one hour of the morning joint sitting of the USSR Supreme Soviet chambers on 28 February was devoted to the solution of one question—what to discuss first: the president's proposal on the composition of the Cabinet of Ministers or the draft Law on the Cabinet of Ministers. [passage omitted]

Deputies V. Yudin, V. Kirillov, and others expressed the opinion that parliament should first ratify the Law on the Cabinet of Ministers, define the principles and directions of the government's activity in the new conditions, and clarify the future structure of the Cabinet of Ministers and then proceed to examine the question of its membership.

It was proposed during the subsequent discussion that the prime minister should also express his view. V. Pavlov asked deputies to note that it is not the Supreme Soviet's task to confirm but merely give its consent to the USSR president's nominations for deputy prime minister and ministers. In his opinion, to make the approval of the nominations of government members dependent on the result of the discussion of the law is essentially a new discussion of the presidential program. And that, V. Pavlov believes, is unlawful. The prime minister also told deputies that members of the government whose appointment has not been duly formalized are finding it very difficult to work. Ministers are in a state of limbo and as a result sometimes do not take the resolute steps that are needed today. Their subordinates, in turn, do not always try to fulfill ministers' decisions because of uncertainty about how long the latter will be there. In view of the urgency of the situation, V. Pavlov stressed, I would ask you to examine the question of the membership of the Cabinet of Ministers quickly now.

However, the prime minister's arguments did not prove very convincing to deputies. Deputy V. Tatarchuk, for example, expressed amazement that ministers are in what V. Pavlov called "limbo." According to the decision of the Fourth Congress of USSR People's Deputies, he recalled, the members of the country's Council of Ministers must continue to perform their duties until the formation of the Cabinet of Ministers and no one has rescinded that decision.

As a result of the unexpectedly turbulent discussion that developed, the participants in the session adopted a decision to begin discussing the draft Law on the country's Cabinet of Ministers. The debate promises to be long and difficult. Before giving the floor to deputy A. Chabanov, the first speaker, A. Lukyanov announced that 42 people had put their names down to speak in the debate.

Defense Complex Management System Retention Urged

PM0403142591 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 2 Mar 91 First Edition p 2

[Report by legislative correspondents Captain Second Rank V. Urban and Captain Third Rank V. Yermolin under "From the USSR Supreme Soviet" rubric: "Deputies Agree With the President"]

[Excerpt] In accordance with the schedule, candidacies for the Cabinet of Ministers submitted by the USSR president should have been discussed Thursday morning [28 February]. However, deputies insisted that the first reading of the Law on the Cabinet of Ministers be passed first, and the ministerial appointments approved afterward.

The following arguments were cited: The proposed structure of the government and its tasks may change.... And what will happen then? In principle the debate on the draft law confirmed these fears. Setting aside what one of the deputies described as "his problems" (and they definitely predominated in speeches), the debate centered mainly on the structure of the Cabinet of Ministers.

Let us hear the opinion of L.V. Sharin, acting chairman of the Defense and State Security Committee, for example:

"In the current complex political and economic situation members of the committee deem it expedient not to break up the existing defense complex management system. Especially since two reorganizations of the defense sectors of industry were carried out in 1988-1989, and the apparatus reduced by 40 percent. In view of the particular importance for our state of maintaining the current defense potential at a sufficient level, we deem it necessary to preserve during a period of 3-5 years the existing system of defense complex management, the state order for the development and production of military hardware, and also the present defense industry ministries, the State Commission for Military-Industrial Questions, and the USSR Gosplan [State Planning Committee] subdivisions in charge of planning in the defense sectors. At the same time it may be possible during the transitional period to approve new normative acts and defense complex management mechanisms and to work toward the establishment of major associations and concerns operating on principles of large-scale specialization with a view to ensuring the further preconditions for the functioning of industry without a ministerial structure. Practice is already advancing in this direction."

We have not cited Sharin in such detail by accident. And not just because this matter concerns the defense industry. Similar problems were also raised by other deputies. It was emphasized that the management structures in certain sectors must not be "cut to the quick before preconditions for the transition to the market are created." The draft law on the Cabinet of Ministers was passed in the first reading, but judging by appearances, the main debates lie ahead. [passage omitted]

People's Deputy From Krasnodar Kray Registered

PM0403162591 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 28 Feb 91 Union Edition p 2

[Unattributed report under "Direct Line" rubric: "At Central Electoral Commission for Election of USSR People's Deputies"]

[Text] On the basis of the district electoral commission protocol and in accordance with articles 57 and 62 of the USSR Law "On The Election of USSR People's Deputies" the Central Electoral Commission has registered USSR People's Deputy Nikolay Ivanovich Gorovoy, deputy chairman of Krasnodar Kray Soviet of People's Deputies and chairman of the krayispolkom [kray soviet executive committee], a resident of Krasnodar who was elected 17 February 1991 in the Timashevskiy No. 84 Territorial Electoral District of Krasnodar Kray in the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic.

Political & Social

Cabinet of Ministers Session Held

PM0503113691 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 Mar 91 Second Edition pp 1-2

[TASS report: "At the USSR Cabinet of Ministers"]

[Text] President Mikhail Gorbachev chaired a session of the Cabinet 4 March. The session examined a wide range of issues; the life of the country and its people rests on the solution of these issues. The participants in the session—leaders of governments of Union and autonomous republics, ministries and departments, and representatives of public organizations—made a demanding and strict analysis of the fulfilment of economic agreements between the USSR and the republics on stabilizing the socioeconomic situation in the state and on supplying food and agricultural raw materials in the current year.

The basic conclusion made at the session was that the fulfillment by the republics of the treaties they have signed, and also the implementation by the center of its commitments in relation to the republics, are proceeding in an extremely unsatisfactory manner. As a result, the country and society have found themselves in a grave situation.

The urgent measures undertaken by the head of the Soviet state, jointly with the republican leaders, at the beginning of last year allowed important steps aimed at stabilizing social production. First and foremost, this concerned the strengthening of economic relations between enterprises on the basis of mutual treaties.

Speakers pointed out sharply that the situation in the economic and social life of the country has deteriorated and in a number of spheres it is becoming intolerable. In the first two months of the year there has been a fall in production and national incomes. These problems are particularly intensifying in the reduction in the volume of extraction and supply of oil to domestic and foreign markets. At the same time, the price of oil is sharply falling on the world market.

One of the most serious reasons for the aggravation of economic problems is the violation of economic links. This thesis was heard in the speeches of all the participants. A paradoxical situation has taken shape. The center, the republic, the oblast, and the rayon are all telling the enterprises who should receive products. This is simply impermissible. Many speakers stressed that in the country now people are more engaged in the distribution and dividing up of material blessings than their production.

In this situation it is especially difficult for the small republics. As was noted, the major republics are making agreements damaging to their interests; they are trying to form new parallel structures alongside the existing central bodies. Against the background of the worsening conditions of industry and other sectors of the national economy, the imbalance of the financial system is worsening.

Political forces are promoting their own ambitions by embarking on dangerous ventures, and in particular they are calling on people to go on strikes, and turn against the interests of society and themselves.

The most important thing the leaders of the republics paid attention to was that one must not permit any further slump in production. Now it is necessary to concentrate all forces on increasing its volumes, on scientific-technical progress, raising the effectiveness of work at each place. Only this will make it possible to get the economy out of the crisis, and save the country from dependence on imports. At the same time, one must once again analyze the structure of exports: output, extremely necessary to the country, is going abroad, as a result the collapse of the internal market is being aggravated.

Note was also made of the huge reserves of valuable goods and materials accumulated by enterprises and at depots. It was stressed that economic incentive must be created for the sale of surplus goods and materials.

The participants in the session pointed out that problems would be resolved not by following old administrative ways but by moving towards the market consistently and energetically. At present we are concentrating our efforts, strengthening our positions, and preparing conditions for the transfer to a market system and to complete independence and responsibility of commodity producers.

It was noted that difficulties can be resolved today by the republics and the center only jointly.

The main attention at the sitting was devoted to setting up an efficient mechanism for realization of the entire package of economic agreements between the republics and the USSR. It was stressed that the maximum assistance to the preservation of the established economic ties, and a free flow of production between enterprises and the country's regions is one of most important tasks during the transfer to the market. Statements by leaders of a number of republics that delivery commitments of consumer goods and foodstuffs, fuel, and power will be fulfilled by all means have been taken into account.

Participants in the sitting agreed that common approaches to finances, budget, and extra-budgetary funds for stabilization of the economy are vitally necessary at present. The issue of a coordinated policy on pricing was examined as a key issue.

The committee on stabilization of economic ties which is being set up was instructed to take urgent measures in a ten-day period for the final settlement of unresolved issues in implementation of economic agreements. At the same time, particular importance was devoted to problems linked with foodstuffs supplies, preparation for spring sowing, and the situation in the building industry. It was decided to examine the proposals submitted at the sitting at the Federation Council.

The results of the discussion were summed up by USSR President M.S. Gorbachev. V.S. Pavlov, USSR prime minister, spoke at the sitting.

Gorbachev Views Cabinet Meeting

LD0403205691 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1800 GMT 4 Mar 91

[Interview with President Mikhail Gorbachev by unidentified "Vremya" correspondent on 4 March; place not given; from the "Vremya" newscast—recorded]

[Text] [Correspondent] Mikhail Sergeyevich, it is known that a sitting of the cabinet of ministers took place today led by you, chaired by you. Could you tell us, perhaps briefly, what was discussed at the meeting?

[Gorbachev] All right; however, this sitting is not yet finished. Tomorrow comrades will formulate the main proposals to decide on the the instructions were worked out at this sitting. Prior to its adoption, this draft decision will be submitted to the Federation Council, which will meet on 6 March. The draft Union treaty, prepared by the working group, by republican working groups, will also be examined then.

So what was discussed at the present sitting of the cabinet of ministers? Incidentally, the chairmen of the governments, the prime ministers, the chairmen of the councils of ministers of all republics, and their deputies for agricultural affairs and supply were invited to it; the leaders of associations of industrial enterprises from many republics, including Union associations, were invited; and the leaders of autonomous entities, autonomous formations, and autonomous republics were also invited. Under discussion were two most important documents forming the basis for the work of labor collectives, union republics, and central departments is being built today—I am thinking of the economic agreement for 1991 and the agreement on questions relating to the supply of foodstuffs for 1991 that have been concluded and signed by the top leaders of the republics and the Soviet Union. The situation in the country is not a simple one. The crisis manifestations are still building up. The situation and the state of affairs at the enterprises and in retail trade is such that all of these questions are becoming urgent in character. They require intervention and definite solutions, and it was by way of monitoring the manner in which both these decisions [as heard] are being fulfilled that it was decided to hold this session of the cabinet of ministers.

I should say that, all in all, a tough, demanding and businesslike discussion took place. Frankly speaking, however, the preparations for this sitting and the very examination of the state of affairs in the country's economy, particularly the food situation, cause both the cabinet of ministers and me as president great anxiety. We talked about what needs to be done to keep a hold, nonetheless, on the situation and to attempt to change it for the better.

Over the first two months of this year, with regard to foodstuffs, the results of the work of all the republics have been lower than was planned, lower than the levels planned in these agreements. Of course, this is having an effect, and people can see this on the shelves. Several specific problems were examind in support of livestock breeding, trying to resolve matters relating to preparation for and carrying out of spring work in the fields—and this has already begun in the southern part of the country. This concerns fuel and lubricants, spare parts and ordinary things, but things that have to be done because the country is undertaking sowing, and intends to live and tackle tasks—and this is always very important. Every day here is important.

Matters of reciprocal supplies between republics were also examined. These also leave much to be desired. In other words, not all republics have kept their word on reciprocal supplies, and this was examined. Specific matters were examined relating to the import of food products. We talked about not letting things get worse.

That's the first thing. The second thing here is that many of the problems connected with our economy's transition to a market system are being discussed properly and thoroughly. It is our choice. We are going to do this and step by step we will move in this direction. This is the development of people's economic independence and initiative, their enterprise, now necessary but lost in years past. This is what follows from the programs for the transition to a market system which have been adopted by the Supreme Soviet.

At the same time, however, the most natural necessity is to support the production activities and economic activities of all enterprises, kolkhozes, sovkhozes, construction projects, and so forth. Here there are also quite a number of difficulties and, although at first sight it would seem as if much has been achieved by the measures adopted at the end of the year and the start of the year to restore economic links—it was reported at the cabinet session that contracts have been concluded, a program has been concluded, 86 percent of contracts have been fulfilled—but this is not yet everything, not the whole reality and not the whole truth. There are many shortfalls of the type that have a very ocnsiderable effect on the work of many of our enterprises, particularly the large ones, the machine-building enterprises, connected with the use of chemical products. Therefore, the discussion was concerned with ways of further continuing this work of restoring economic relations and not permitting any fall in production. For this is a matter of people's wages, directly involving their families. It is also the profit of an enterprise, meaning the fate and development of this enterprise. It is also a matter of budget contributions—Union, republics, and local ones. Therefore, I would say that the issue of production, of not allowing it to fall sharply, is a central issue. This was indeed the focal point of this session.

A number of additional measures were adopted, mapped out for implementation, that should permit the harmonizing of inter-republican agreements and what comes from state orders on the basis of the joint activities of the central departments and the republics. In the places where there were shortfalls, not to permit them, or rather, fill in these gaps to support the production activity of the labor...[corrects himself] the activeness of the production collectives.

That is the most important thing. Finally, there was talk about the fact that there would have to be discipline. Financial discipline should be firmly observed, and that envisaged by the agreement must be fulfilled. Indeed, it defines what the taxes are and how the revenues from these taxes should be distributed, to what ends.

I have just been in Belorussia. I was asked all the time: What about your 5-percent sales tax? They would say: That is your presidential tax. What do you do with all the revenue from it? I must say that this tax was also included from the very beginning in the economic agreement that was signed by all the republics. Incidentally, of the revenue from this tax, 70 percent goes to the republican local budgets and 30 percent to the Union budget.

Well, that is all incidental, in view of the fact that such interest was displayed in Belorussia. So, the central questions of economic life connected with social questions are also connected were the focus of this session of the Cabinet of Ministers.

[Correspondent] Thank you very much, Mikhail Sergeyevich. We reserve the right to return to this conversation after the Council of the Federation session.

[Gorbachev] Good, agreed. Goodbye.

[Correspondent] Goodbye.

Appeal Issued for Scrap Metal

LD0403213191 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1800 GMT 4 Mar 91

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] As a result of the extremely serious situation arising in the country's metallurgical industry, to a large extent also due to the miners' strikes last year, the USSR Cabinet of Ministers has appealed to the governments of Union and autonomous republics, and to the country's labor collectives and citizens, requesting that they set about vigorously organizing the collection, in all places, of ferrous and rare metal scrap. Unused scrap resources in the national economy are alone estimated at over 10 million tonnes. They could fully ensure the uninterrupted work of the metallurgical industry, the appeal says. The full text will be published in the press.

Union Treaty Talks Reach 'Critical Point'

*91UN0978B Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
28 Feb 91 Second Edition p 3*

[Article by TASS correspondent S. Zharkov: "Negotiations Have Reached a Critical Point"]

[Text]*It appears that the negotiations of the plenipotentiaries of the republics on the coordination of the text of* *the Union treaty have reached a critical point. In the last few days appeals have been heard more and more often "to lay the cards on the table," and, while no longer trying to reach a consensus, try at least to observe a balance of interests.*

Arguments are continuously turning "full circle." Here is why. On the agenda now is the question of forming Union bodies of authority and administration. Movement forward on the development of specific mechanisms of republic representation again runs into the unresolved problem of membership in the Union. Uzbekistan, Kazakhstan, and Tajikistan have taken a rather tough, and I would even say an unappeasable, position with respect to the former autonomies: Either these republics are in the Union structure or they are in the structure of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic]. Voices can be heard also about the fact that the sovereignties have not been formulated legally, just as their relations with Russia have not been formulated by treaties.

Thus, a majority of the former autonomies want to sign the Union treaty immediately and be subjects of the Union. What is the position of the leadership of Russia? V.V. Isakov, chairman of the Council of the Republic of the Russian Federation Supreme Soviet, declared at the plenary meeting of 27 February that "this is an internal affair of Russia." He explained that the RSFSR is on the threshold of concluding a federative treaty in which much is not yet clear. From his point of view it makes no sense to anticipate the resolution of these complicated problems.

However, the uncertainty of Russia's position, in the words of P.Kh. Nasyrov (Uzbekistan), is blocking the work on forming the future mechanism of the USSR Supreme Soviet and other representative Union organs on issues connected with quotas. Therefore, a decision was made for the time being to consider the final provisions of the document concerning symbolism, the capital, the official language of the Union, and others that do not evoke particular arguments and questions.

Also adding to the complexity of the problems being considered is the completely understandable human fatigue. A large number of strongly worded statements by representatives of Central Asian delegations can very likely be attributed to this. Actually, the negotiations have been dragging on for about a month now. One can understand the people who live together, almost without a break, in the Moscow suburb pension "Morozovka."

In the opinion of V.N. Likhachev, leader of one of the working groups and chairman of the Tatarstan Constitutional Oversight Committee, the search for compromise resolutions will drag out inevitably. The diversity of political aspirations of the republics has an effect, and, moreover, attempts to achieve agreement lead to the creation of unwieldy and clumsy wording...

Time will tell how workable this system will be.

Second Round of Talks End

LD0203065791 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1905 GMT 1 Mar 91

[By TASS diplomatic correspondent S. Zharkov]

[Text] Moscow, 1 Mar (TASS)—The second round of talks on harmonizing the text of a new Union treaty has ended in the Morozovka boarding house near Moscow. Plenipotentiary representatives from republics are participating.

The majority of versions submitted have caused no arguments or amendments, although in some cases alternative editions of articles have been adopted.

The problems are not simple ones. The section devoted to Union bodies includes the status of the USSR president and vice president and the principles of forming the Union parliament to which participants in the negotiating process have been unable to find an acceptable solution for a long time.

The last day was not without surprises. While discussing an article defining the rules for joining the Union and its membership, V.B. Isakov, chairman of the Soviet of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic, came out against the version advocated by representatives of former autonomies. He pointed out that the proposed version lays down a disparity between the procedures for joining the Union and the Russian Federation. At the same time, however, he stressed the right of autonomies to have a point of view of their own and proposed to register alternative version.

As a preliminary assessment, one can say that plenipotentiary representatives from Azerbaijan, Belorussia, Kazakhstan, Kirghizi, Russia, Tajikistan, Turkmenia, Uzbekistan, the Ukraine and 18 former autonomous republics have filled the task, in general. Now is up for the federation council to have its say. Of course, this is not yet a final text ready for publishing and signing. But the foundation for the cornerstaone of a renewed federation has been prepared.

Differences Remain

PM0403223191 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 5 Mar 91 Union Edition p 1

[G. Shipitko report: "Draft Union Treaty Agreed"]

[Text] Work on the draft Union Treaty was, in the main, completed yesterday. It was signed by plenipotentiary representatives of 27 republics, including eight union republics. Representatives of Azerbaijan attended as observers. The Baltic republics, Moldova, Georgia, and Armenia did not participate in elaborating the draft treaty.

We still have to interpret and be aware of the results of two weeks of work on the treaty, the basis of the Union, but it is perfectly obvious that there are different viewpoints on our state's future. This must be taken into account.

Despite the fact that the very work on the draft was difficult and sometimes assumed dramatic hues, in the majority of cases it was possible to find common approaches reflecting the interests of all the parties to the treaty process.

It is impossible not to notice the very characteristic desire not only to endow the center with sufficient powers but also, at the same time, to preserve republics' own right to sovereignty. And now "the republics forming the Union possess full state power and independently determine their state system, their administrative-territorial divisions, and the system of organs of power." At the same time questions of the organization of defense and the leadership of the armed forces, border troops, and defense enterprises remain within the Union's exclusive competence.

This fundamental principle and also, incidentally, the attitude toward ownership, laws, the formation of the Union's organs, and a number of other questions were unambiguously adopted by the republics' representatives. The majority of them now have alternative versions, but there are not that many fundamental differences and, to judge from the agreed draft and the very atmosphere of the plenipotentiary representatives' work, none is contemplated. Particularly as the situation around the draft treaty should not be dramatized, as was pointed out at the final session.

However, at least two important articles have still been left "outside" the treaty. It is a question of the status of former autonomous entities and of their right to participate in the shaping of state policy on equal terms with all. The opinion of a number of republics, including the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic, is this: All sovereign formations must possess equal rights. The objections from the opponents of this viewpoint boiled down to the fact that in this case Russia will obtain an additional 17 votes—which places the other republics in an unequal position. Another article is inseparably linked with this—the republics' representation in the Union's organs of power and management. Agreement has not yet been reached on these articles.

A session of the Federation Council is proposed for 6 March, to discuss the draft Union Treaty signed by the plenipotentiary representatives. And, of course, difficult work in search of common approaches should also be expected there. However, the republics' Supreme Soviets still have to say their final word on the draft Union Treaty.

Treaty Provisions Analyzed

PM0503102791 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 Mar 91 First Edition pp 1-2

[Article by Dr. of Juridical Sciences Professor I. Ilinskiy under the rubric "About the Referendum": "No Going Back to the Past"]

[Text] The published draft Union Treaty marks the attainment of a new stage in the shaping of intraunion relations. The principles governing ties among the republics envisaged in the draft differ substantially not only from those enshrined in the current USSR Constitution but also from the provisions of the 1922 Declaration and Treaty on the Formation of the USSR. The novelty of the approaches to the regulation of intraunion ties is underlined by the fact that relations among the republics are built on the basis of not only intrastate but also international law.

The draft Union Treaty defines the Union's powers in a new way. In the majority of cases the Union exercises them jointly with the republics. A relatively small range of questions remains within the Union's exclusive competence, such as the adoption of the USSR Constitution, the organization of the country's defense, foreign policy and the USSR's representation in international relations, and the management of the defense-industrial complex. At the same time it would be expedient, it seems to me, to define some things more precisely.

For example, the organization of defense, the leadership of the USSR Armed Forces, and the ensuring of the USSR's state security must undoubtedly fall within the Union's exclusive competence. But, at the same time, the republics could also "join in" elaborating the concept of military organizational development and the general structure of the USSR Armed Forces.

In just the same way the USSR's representation in the international arena cannot fail to be the Union's exclusive authority. At the same time the republics could participate in formulating the main areas of USSR foreign policy. And when the USSR concludes international treaties on questions affecting the republics' competence, preliminary agreement with the latter would be envisaged.

In my view it would be expedient to strengthen the rights of the Union on certain questions over which the draft grants it powers. For example, it is hard to imagine how management of the country's unified fuel and energy system and of railroad, air, sea, and main pipeline transport can be*managed jointly with the republics. For it is a question precisely of management which, in this case, can be carried out most efficiently only by the Union. On the other hand, programs for the development of the fuel and energy system and transport must, of course, be drawn up with the republics' participation.

The draft treaty also does not resolve clearly the question of delimiting the property of the Union and the republics. Whereas the draft contains specific provisions on the republics' property, it speaks very vaguely of the Union's property. However, this problem is of fundamental significance and is linked with its definition as a sovereign state. I believe that the question of the Union's property must be resolved (of course, by agreement among the republics) in the spirit of the new USSR Law on Ownership.

The draft Union Treaty proposes a legal base to put an end to the union and republican laws "war." The draft enshrines this principle: Supremacy belongs to the law which was adopted within the framework of the competence, correspondingly, of the Union or the republic. This takes into account both the provisions of the republics' declarations of sovereignty proclaiming the supremacy of republican laws and the common interests of the republics and the Union; it is for the sake of satisfying these interests that union laws are, in fact, adopted.

Of course, disagreements over questions of legislative competence cannot be ruled out in the future. In this case the draft provides for the republics' right to appeal against a USSR law if it goes beyond the powers of the Union and runs counter to a republic's constitution. As well as the Union's right to appeal against the republics' legislative acts if they violate the Union Treaty, the Union Constitution, and USSR laws. Conciliatory procedures are also provided for to resolve the said disputes. Such disputes may also be forwarded to the USSR Constitutional Court. The said provisions ought to be supplemented by norms on the legal consequences of appeals and the procedure for examining them.

Article 6 of the draft contains an important provision. It provides that a republic may, by means of concluding an agreement with the USSR, additionally transfer to it the implementation of some of its powers. The USSR may also do the same with the agreement of all the republics. This essentially means that individual republics may have a special status within the USSR.

The draft's provisions on organs of power and management are marked by fundamentally new approaches. Whereas previously the structures of republican and local organs were established by union laws, it follows from the draft that such structures will be determined by the republics independently.

It is obvious that there is no going back to the past. As for the future, the only possible alternative to the new Union is its disintegration.

Public Polled on Referendum Voting Intentions

PM0403142991 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
2 Mar 91 Second Edition p 3

[Report by Zh. Toshchenko, Director of the Sociological Rsearch Center, under the rubric "On the referendum": "Opinion"]

[Text] The Sociological Research Center conducted an all-union study entitled "Politics and the People: February 1991" on 19-21 February 1991.

In the course of the study, the population's attitude to the All-Union Referendum was elucidated. Some 1,575 people were polled in 18 parts of the country, including seven republics—the Ukraine, Belorussia, Latvia, Armenia, Uzbekistan, Kazakhstan, and Moldova.

Below we publish the distribution of replies (in precentages).

To the question "What do you think of the holding of an All-Union Referendum on the question of the preservation of the USSR?" the answers were as follows:
In favor—61 percent.
More or less in favor—13 percent.
More or less against—7 percent.
Against—9 percent.
Hard to say—10 percent.

To the question "If the referendum on whether the Union should or should not exist were held tomorrow, would you take part or not?" the answers were:
Yes—71 percent.
No—10 percent.
Undecided—18 percent.
No reply—1 percent.

The question which is being put to the referendum reads as follows: "Do you consider it necessary to preserve the USSR as a renewed federation of equal sovereign republics, in which the rights and freedoms of persons of any nationality will be guaranteed in full?"

If the referendum were held tomorrow, how would you answer this question?
Yes—68 percent.
No—11 percent.
Undecided—20 percent.
No reply—1 percent.

Dzasokhov Addresses University Communists

PM0503095191 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
2 Mar 91 Second Edition p 2

[Unattributed report: "Moscow State University Communists Determine Position"]

[Text] A conference of the M.V. Lomonosov Moscow State University [MGU] party organization, which has over 7,000 CPSU members, has been held there. Party members include well-known scientists, leaders of scientific schools, experienced teachers, young specialists, postgraduates, and other students. Delegates discussed tasks connected with the beginning of the MGU's work as an autonomous body. The USSR Government resolution granted the university the status of a self-managing educational institution. It offers great prospects for the effective use of the MGU's mighty scientific and teaching potential and its further development.

Delegates determined ways to democratize the management of the university on the basis of the MGU's new statute. There were demands to Communist leaders on the urgency of measures to ensure the social protection of students, postgraduates, teachers, and staffers.

Communists urged all members of the university's collective to take part in the All-Union Referendum, to take an active civic stance, and to answer "yes" to the referendum question.

Delegates examined the party organization's 1991 budget for the first time and approved it.

The conference was addressed by A.S. Dzasokhov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee for International Affairs. He particularly drew the attention of the leading university's Communists to the special importance of the party's political tasks connected with holding the All-Union referendum on preserving the USSR, the results of which will decisively influence the country's future. A.S. Dzasokhov reported on progress in the preparation for the conclusion of a new Union Treaty and perestroyka in the party and also dwelt on a number of questions of international life.

The CPSU Central Committee secretary talked about concrete measures to fulfill the 28th party congress resolution "On the CPSU's policy in the sphere of education, science, and culture."

A.S. Dzasokhov told conference delegates that the CPSU Central Committee Secretariat, having examined the reports of the CPSU Central Committee Commission on Science, Education, and Culture connected with the development of fundamental science in conditions of the transition to the market, deemed it expedient to submit a question on the CPSU's current policy in the sphere of science to the Politburo. The CPSU Central Committee intends to take all measures to accelerate the examination of these problems in parliament and also the draft law on intellectual property and a number of others connected with the development of science and education. As a legislative initiative it will be proposed that the aforementioned questions be included on the agenda of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

The Central Committee secretary congratulated party conference delegates on the fact that the university is the first higher educational institution in the country to be granted autonomous status.

Position on the Question of the USSR Referendum

The first referendum in the country's history will be held on 17 March.

The question submitted to the referendum is this: "Do you consider it necessary to preserve the USSR as a renewed federation of equal sovereign republics, in which the rights and freedoms of persons of any nationality will be guaranteed in full?"

We will have to make a choice of enormous historical importance—whether to preserve our state as a single renewed federation of sovereign republics capable of ensuring the normal life of its citizens and their democratic rights. Our country has been created by the labor and struggle of many generations of people of different nationalities. Millions of people have contributed to the creation of the economic might and the development of the spiritual culture of the fatherland and paid with their lives for our motherland's freedom and independence.

We want to ensure a worthy future for ourselves and our descendants and do not want to squander our strength in fruitless mutual hostility and a struggle for survival. The experience of the most developed states shows convincingly that only an association based on mutual respect and trust can help to cope with the rapidly advancing crisis.

Discord and the absence of unity have always resulted in tremendous and senseless losses whereas the united efforts of all the peoples of our motherland have made it possible to emerge with honor from the most grave and seemingly fatal situations. This is all the more true for the world at the end of the 20th century when powerful integration forces are determining the face of the world community.

On the eve of the voting let us consider what the disintegration of the Union will mean. The disruption of the established economic and cultural ties, the loss of defense capability, the disintegration of science, education, and culture, and territorial conflicts are obvious.

The USSR is a great power and all states are attentively following the course of the discussion on the future of the Union because its outcome will undoubtedly have a serious effect on the state of affairs in the world.

The referendum must unite all truly democratic forces on the basis of creative work in building a renewed, humane, and law-governed society.

We appeal to all students, postgraduates, teachers, and staffers of the Moscow University to take part in the referendum and adopt an active civic stance.

Communists urge everyone to answer "yes" to the referendum question.

Adopted at the Moscow University Party Organization Conference 28 February 1991.

Ivashko on Referendum, Other Topics

PM0403164591 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 28 Feb 91 First Edition p 4

[Interview with V. Ivashko, deputy general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, by Aleksandr Belikov; place and date not given: "'Actions Are Needed, Chiefly in the Sphere of Practice'"]

[Text] [Belikov] In just a few days each one of us, as citizen of a great power, will drop a paper in a ballot box to say whether that power is to continue to be great and united or... That "or" is what places the upcoming referendum in the category of events of unparalleled importance. Why, Vladimir Antonovich, do you not consider it advisable for the party's best forces—the aktiv and apparatus workers from the Central Committee down to the raykoms [rayon committees]—to go off on assignment to cities and villages? To meet people. Discussion with them is always useful, especially now. If only because recently we have heard it said, now on one side, now on another, that the center is to blame for all our troubles and has robbed and is continuing to rob the outlying districts. And since this is so, the argument runs, we should part company with it. The reply sounds equally paradoxical: Why not calculate who is in debt to whom?

[Ivashko] Despite the clear priority of the problem, you cannot abandon everything and deal with just one matter. Especially as its sources lie in the present state of society: Crisis phenomena have penetrated virtually every sphere of our life. I do not doubt even for a minute that they will be overcome—our people's life-giving forces are tremendous. That time will certainly come, but we can hasten its arrival and considerably shorten the duration of the process. And, most importantly of all, alleviate the difficulties for the people. We must reach the new society by the shortest road.

[Belikov] But before setting off along that road, there would be some point in finding out what the other political parties and movements propose.

[Ivashko] We have analyzed many programs and they contain many interesting points. However, believe me, any unbiased scholar or practical worker unequivocally admits: Apart from the CPSU, no other political force in the country possesses such a program of constructive action. It is easy to prove that.

[Belikov] Arguments are an adornment to dialogue.

[Ivashko] In recent years words with the prefix "de" have entered the active vocabulary of many popular and not so popular politicians, and also, incidentally, of many newspapers—defederalization, deideologization, depoliticization, departyization, de-Sovietization, and so forth. However, "de" is a summons to destruction, not creation. Incidentally, lovers of these words demand: "Private ownership for land!" But what are people going to do with this, given the existing infrastructure? As recent facts show, peasants, when they gain freedom, unfailingly seek to form cooperatives and to unite. So they can work more efficiently. Take a trip to Rostov Oblast, say, and you will see for yourself that my words are correct. May my opponents forgive me, but talk such as "hand it over, and that will work automatically" shows that they have studied life, as a rule, on the basis of their own writings: Only the CPSU is capable of leading people to solve the accumulated problems. And it has to deal with all matters simultaneously.

[Belikov] Nevertheless, the party allocates its forces in the light of the priority of tasks.

[Ivashko] Each specific moment makes some sphere of the party's activity urgent and one requiring special attention. Today there are several such spheres, and they are all closely interconnected. Of course, the question of the preservation of a USSR built on a new foundation is among those of exceptional importance. But it "encapsulates" them all at once. Without a full-blooded Union nothing will happen. Just as there will be no winners if it falls apart. Society, the economy, culture, and science have been formed over the decades and even centuries. To chop up overnight everything that has been acquired is adventurism, and errant, barefaced adventurism at that. Does a person demolish his old house before he has built a new one? Some people in our country would like to destroy first and then, they say, we shall see. It is certainly easier for everyone to build a new economy together, and all talk of the possibility of a regional economy prospering in total isolation is no more than a bluff. Show me an enterprise leader who denies the need for the existence of clearly organized economic links. Yes, some are devotees of the old system of centralized planning, while others recognize only market relations. But they all presuppose binding and stable national economic links. Can the party watch what is happening in indifference? Of course not. So the party must deal with everything. As regards the priority issues that are being put forward, you are right. And, incidentally, your first question came almost three weeks late. For that was when the CPSU Central Committee formed appropriate groups of party workers and sent guidelines to party committees. A Central Committee Secretariat session has just heard what the Chuvash party organization is doing to prepare for the referendum. And, you know, Communists are acting inventively in Chuvashia. And not only there.

[Belikov] The present executive power is yet another example of a flaw in the political reform, which in turn is having an extremely negative impact on the development of the economy.

[Ivashko] And how! Man—in his capacity as entrepreneur and producer—does not know where power lies and whom to entreat: the rayon, the oblast, the republic, or the center. There is virtually no executive power, but people are engaged in something like a tug-of-war: Place yourself under republican jurisdiction, things will be better, they advise an enterprise, but the enterprise objects: Let well alone, the confusion will end one day, so I am remaining under Union jurisdiction. In order to prevent this merry-go-round, we should complete the phase of priority tasks in the political reform as swiftly as possible. And not seek work for ourselves like the manifestly absurd job of calculating who is owed how much by a specific republic. Maybe a mechanism for the calculation will eventually be found, but is it moral to make the calculation? No, this is a thankless and unequivocally unproductive task: This arithmetic will give no one anything. A renewed Union and the market—those are the main factors in our stability and prosperity.

[Belikov] The leadership of certain republics subscribes to a different view in this regard, as shown by their refusal to take part in the referendum. How is it going to be held in this case?

[Ivashko] Yes, it is precisely the leading circles of several republics that are refusing to hold the referendum. Here too the party's position is clear: It advocates sovereignty for the republics and their right to self-determination. Up to and including secession. But this must be carried out only on a constitutional basis. If a republic desires to secede from the USSR, then the mechanism envisaged in the Law on Secession must be put into effect. Even a divorce, let alone this, produces a slew of problems that are resolved within the framework of the law. For instance, defense, power industry, and similar facilities were constructed on the premise of an integral Union—what is to become of them? You cannot carry them in a briefcase.

But that is by no means the main point: No republic will be able to exist autonomously outside the USSR. Claims to the contrary are no more than the product of fantasy mixed up with misunderstanding of the basic principles of economics, politics, and international relations. Production efficiency and therefore living standards are always higher where integration processes are under way. And all these indicators slide downward wherever disintegration is taking place. A black period of calamities will begin for any republic that decides to sever the former relations. And people, remembering how they lived before, will not want to spend any more time in a terrible nightmare. A powerful centripetal process will begin. Such things have happened before. For instance, when the United States was created. And now, 200 years later, integration processes are taking place in Europe. Admittedly, on a totally different basis from across the ocean. Incidentally, only narrow-minded politicians abroad are interested in the collapse of the Union. If that happens, just imagine what will happen to the world security system and to relations among states? A totally new picture will be created, and one which the world has already seen, incidentally. For instance, on the eve of World Wars I and II. Who needs disruption of the prevailing balance? For it will unfailingly lead to war, most likely a major one. Because huge stockpiles of weapons have been accumulated in the world. Just look, the war in the Persian Gulf has mobilized virtually the whole world community. But that is peanuts compared to the Soviet Union and its republics. It has to be borne in mind that the USSR has a very high level of armaments.

The integration process cannot be stopped. If someone does not hold the referendum today, it will be held without fail later. There is no need to lead anyone along on a rope—people will understand everything for themselves.

[Belikov] Many people believe: Perestroyka opened up the floodgates for democratization and glasnost, but has not coped with other most important tasks. What would be your reply to your grandson, say, if he asked you in 10-15 years: What did you engage in for the six years of perestroyka?

[Ivashko] In perestroyka! It is a different matter that the real state of society was incorrectly assessed, and everyone without exception must be aware of this. But how could we have known? Our social sciences performed mainly service functions. A stratified awareness had taken shape in society: one set of terms for speeches at meetings, another for conversations with comrades at work, a third for conversations at home, and so forth. Of course, the top layer reflected a certain well-being in social life, as it were. And when the processes of democratization and glasnost began, all the layers became mixed up, as though in water. And many people had a hand in this. Including people of whom my view is unequivocally negative. They love neither their people, nor the motherland, nor their forebears. And they have decided to rewrite history. We can see the result of this—the wave of defamation of absolutely everything. But our country has many bright pages that would adorn the history of any people. Why are these so diligently glossed over, or else frankly spat upon? This has naturally misled some people. The errors in implementing the economic reform which exacerbated the situation in the consumer market led to powerful new discontent among people. And what is the worth of the actions of the new nepmen [allusion to private operators who flourished under Lenin's New Economic Policy], who generously reward the activity of those who diligently maintain the unstable state of society? All this has led to the present situation. That is what I would say to my grandson. And also that in our work we were sober in assessing the situation and did not subscribe to any dogmas. We proceeded from the realities of each specific day.

[Belikov] The press has carried claims which boil down to saying that the government has adopted a course of restoring totalitarianism and implanting a police regime in the economy and in social life in the country.

[Ivashko] This is being said and written in the light of instructions. But not from Central Committee plenums, but very different meetings. Visit any cell of society—a plant workshop or a kolkhoz livestock unit—and you will hear that people are above all demanding the imposition of order. In the broadest sense of the term. I recently visited the Minsk Motor Vehicle Plant. Workers asked for "iron" to be shown. Indicating his hands, one of them said: "I will make everything necessary out of metal. I cannot not work—I feel ashamed. Impose order in intereconomic links!" The workers also demanded that order be imposed in their provision with industrial goods and food. Can you say anything against this?

Crime is increasing—here too there is a need for order. Now let us take a look at the government's actions. The Cabinet of Ministers decided to exchange 50- and 100-ruble bills. The next day a number of newspapers sounded the alarm under splash headlines: They have robbed the people! Name just one worker from whom even one 50-ruble bill was taken away. There are no such people. If, say, a salesclerk in a meat department from Donetsk who brought large-denomination bills totaling tens of thousands of rubles in for the exchange has suffered, then I have no sympathy for him, his money was not earned by honest labor.

Or take another decision—on joint patrols by the militia and army servicemen. Whom does this hamper? A passerby returning from work or from visiting friends in the evening? Why such a heated display of discontent when the appearance of soldiers in city streets has not increased hooliganism but, on the contrary, has reduced it?

I do not think that a worker, peasant, or functionary living on his wages will be opposed to another government decision—the right of militia and KGB organs to check financial documents in institutions. But, once again, this is receiving a hostile reception in their name.

Another point. You can only describe as elementary political intrigue the actions of those who just a few months ago were advocating price reform, but are now zealously preaching a totally different approach.

[Belikov] You have touched on the problem of imposing order. People have a good word to say about Yu.V. Andropov in this connection.

[Ivashko] There is one thing I do not understand here: Has little been said on this subject? Is someone once again supposed to issue an appeal: "Comrades, work in a disciplined fashion!" Or should everyone realize this?

[Belikov] There are many people who believe that the situation in the economy could be rectified more swiftly if Western specialists were used.

[Ivashko] It is always useful to listen to competent and experienced people. But our society was formed for several decades on its own specific basis. And no American will be able to understand it if we ourselves have so far been able to assess its real condition in by no means every respect. Even the finest specialist does not know our people's mentality, he has a totally different way of thinking from ours. For instance, in Germany it would not occur to anyone to cross the street on a red light even if the street was empty. What about in our country? So such prescriptions are extremely naive. Surely it is better for us all to roll up our sleeves and get down to business in a responsible manner? As is well known, our country is rich in talent.

[Belikov] At the USSR Supreme Soviet session Deputy Yu. Koltsov, citing a publication in the press, expressed the supposition that the leadership of the CPSU (at the least two Central Committee Politburo members, Burokevicius and Rubiks) is implicated in the creation of the National Salvation Committees in Latvia and Lithuania. In this connection he asked the justice minister to assess the accuracy of the press reports and in the light of this to decide on the possibility or otherwise of registering the CPSU. You, Vladimir Antonovich, described the deputy's question as political and noted that the CPSU will not ignore it but will demand that the author prove every point of his accusation. Telling its readers about this, KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA notes that Article 13 of the Law "On the Status of USSR People's Deputy" does not envisage that a deputy must prove any proposition of his question.

[Ivashko] You have to be an extremely naive person not to realize that Deputy's Koltsov's speech was an attempt to outlaw the party. That is why I call the question "political." If a question has arisen in connection with the activity of M. Burokevicius, A. Rubiks, or anyone else, regardless of whatever party they are members of, they must answer before the law. The deputy's speech, as I have already said, pursued a different aim—to defame the party. Naturally, we cannot calmly watch this.

Besides the aforementioned Article 13, there is also a generally accepted legal approach based on the presumption of innocence. It is the person who makes a statement who will have to provide proof. It is all quite elementary: If you make an accusation, prove it!

[Belikov] Vladimir Antonovich, it is six months since you were elected deputy general secretary of the Central Committee. Have there been omissions in your work, and what can be categorized as successes?

[Ivashko] I do not think that now is the time to speak of successes. Dissatisfaction prevails over positive feelings. Primarily dissatisfaction that we have not resolved the main task of making all party cells—from the Central Committee to the party group—really effective. Not talking shops, not panic-stricken, but effective. What is the difficulty? On the one hand, the process of democratization presupposes maximum independence for each party organization. And on the other, the "softening" of the threads linking the party grassroots with the Central Committee arouses dissatisfaction. After the 28th congress we received a vast amount of mail condemning the Central Committee for losing ground. There are not many such letters now—we must be gaining ground. The most important thing now is not to lose what has been gained.

[Belikov] All the same, Vladimir Antonovich, are you happy with the results of your work?

[Ivashko] I think that if anyone has become satisfied with the results of his work, he must urgently change his job.

Kryuchkov Interviewed on Current Issues

LD0503115791 Moscow TASS in English 1141 GMT 5 Mar 91

[By TASS legislative correspondent Vladimir Isachenkov]

[Text] Moscow March 5 TASS—"The bill on state security bodies in the USSR is based on care for human rights", KGB Chief Vladimir Kryuchkov told reporters today.

"In the past, we proceeded from the interests of state security. Our attitudes have changed radically, and we now proceed from the interests of an individual," he said.

Commenting on today's parliamentary debate on the bill, Kryuchkov emphasised that the deputies who said that responsibility of the KGB is not registered by law, lose sight of the fact that "both rights and obligations equally imply responsibility".

Replying to remarks of some deputies that the bill had not been submitted to parliamentary committees in due time, Kryuchkov said that this was not so: that the document was referred to parliament back in last December, and that the KGB received a number of remarks from many committees and a certain number of them were taken into consideration. Kryuchkov expressed satisfaction with the fact that proposals to enhance social protection of KGB staffers were made during the debate today.

"I believe that concern over how security bodies will operate is understandable in view of our history," Kryuchkov said. "The sooner we pass the law, the earlier it is grasped by every Soviet citizen, the more this will help reassure the public about the KGB's actions."

Asked if the KGB supplies information to party organisations, Kryuchkov said that the KGB exchanges information with the Soviet Communist Party and with other public organisations. "This is a natural process in which all the parties are interested," he added.

Describing his view of the process of settlement of the Gulf conflict from the viewpoint of Soviet interests, Kryuchkov emphasised that "the USSR wants the settlement to be profound and large-scale, so that not one of the states should suffer. Kuwait should restore its statehood, and Iraq should preserve its own."

The interest of countries of the region should prevail during the settlement. "The USSR has its own specific interests: We have quite extensive economic and other cooperation with a number of countries of the region. I hope that it will continue to develop."

Plane Set Ablaze After Hijack Thwarted

LD0403221191 Moscow TASS in English 2031 GMT 4 Mar 91

[Text] Moscow March 4 TASS—An attempt to hijack an An-24 passenger airliner of the Arkhangelsk civil aviation administration was thwarted by local security police, KGB information department said today.

The plane was performing a flight from Arkhangelsk to Leningrad via Kotlas. After it took off in Kotlas, a passenger passed a note to the plane's crew and, threatening to blow up the plane with an anti-tank grenade, demanded to fly to Sweden.

The captain of the crew reported to the ground-based services and decided to land in Leningrad.

The local security police managed to talk the hijacker into letting all the passengers leave the plane.

However, when they demanded that he surrender the hijacker blew up the grenade, setting the plane ablaze.

The fire was soon put out. The hijacker received serious wounds and was hospitalised.

The hijacker is Aleksandr Dubovtsev, 32, a resident of the city of Kotlas in Arkhangelsk region.

He has a wife and two children and held a job in the comfort- service cooperative that repairs radio equipment.

The case is being investigated.

[Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian at 2119 GMT on 4 March, in a "Television News Service" report, adds: "A rescue team at Pulkovo airport has neutralized a criminal who had tried to hijack an Aeroflot airliner to Stockholm. The aircraft was on a flight from Kotlas to Leningrad. The criminal resisted arrest, was injured and died in the hospital]

All-Union Conference on Crisis Situation Opens

LD0503030991 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1440 GMT 4 Mar 91

[Text] Moscow, 4 Mar (TASS)—Crisis situations in society is the subject of an all-Union conference of sociologists, economists, and philosophers that opened today. No single modern state has been spared economic, sociopolitical, technological, or ecological crises. They come in cycles. It is the task of scientists to work out recommendations that will help to foresee the causes, timeframe, and consequences of such situations, and also to find timely ways to solve them. The scientific forum, which is being held at the USSR Academy of the National Academy, will last three days.

Significance of Gorbachev Minsk Speech Weighed

PM0103125191 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 28 Feb 91 p 1

[Ya. Yuferova article: "Let Us Agree Where Our Left and Right Are"]

[Text] The president of the country, M.S. Gorbachev, is currently in Belorussia, the republic which in the "constellation of equals" is gravitating toward the center more than the others and is less crippled than the others by economic crisis and interethnic conflicts. Although Chernobyl, that in a very short space of time made refugees of the entire population, is more than enough to make up for all this...

The president's trip was a surprise for many people, but was greeted with hope in the republic. Maybe with his help the country's parliament will understand the scale of the Chernobyl disaster? You cannot cope with this problem alone...

The surprise was evidenced by the fact that right now a Belorussian Government delegation headed by the chairman of the Belorussian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Council of Ministers is in Japan. Japan intends to become one of the donor states in line with the United Nations resolution on Chernobyl.

May the people have one more hope...

The president's favorite genre, in which Mikhail Sergeyevich was unrivaled in the first years of perestroyka, is talking with the people; and considering the current climate it passed off very smoothly at the Minsk Tractor Plant. But a question along the lines of: If things carry on like this the stores will be empty, and we will have to go naked to the May Day demonstration—had an almost rhetorical flavor and contained one implication: People will go to the festive demonstration in Minsk anyway, however hard life is.

For his programmatic speech on the disposition of political forces in the country the president chose patient Belorussia, but there he continued his fundamental argument with B. Yeltsin and G. Popov. His speech to the creative and scientific intelligentsia at the Belorussian SSR Academy of Sciences (we were able to see and hear it on Central Television's First Program Tuesday evening) will be studied and analyzed in detail. Not just in political enlightenment circles.

The president spoke about rabid attacks on the Center by "so-called democrats," and their attempts to cast aspersions on the Union, the referendum, etc. The politicians are still arguing things out among themselves, but there is no sense in getting away from the main point. From the Bug River to the Kurils people are unhappy about the very deep crisis in which they find themselves... Whose fault is it? Opposition political forces? Well, that may be so, but... Previously Gorbachev always stood head and shoulders above his opponents by not lowering himself to seeking out enemies, but now the message is clear: The activity of the opposition is telling on the vital activity of the economy.

Does anyone today have the courage to answer for the standard of living to which we have declined over 73 years? It looks as though a democracy which has not stood up on its own feet, which has never yet held power in the Kremlin, must answer for this.

The president's legitimate desire to sort out where our right and our left are leads to serious reflection. It is indisputable that extreme left-wingers are closing ranks with extreme right-wingers, but attempting to give a reformed totalitarian system a democratic name is a somewhat risky business.

And one last point. Mikhail Sergeyevich has confirmed his adherence to the socialist idea and the socialist choice. A clear-cut position in a politician is always worthy of respect. Many people, particularly of the older generation, for whom ideology has replaced religion, will be satisfied. But today it is hard to persuade the people not to be angry by promising them a better life with the socialist idea in the next century.

People are tired and want to live a normal life today and tomorrow, or even to live just a little in what is their only lifetime. Theoretical discussions on a perpetually empty stomach are not easily digested by the mass consciousness.

We must not be offended by everybody ("I was unlucky with the people"), but it is very easy to take offense at those who talk about the hopelessness of the people's situation. There is a glimmer of hope—the idea of a truce with and not a war against the various political forces was nevertheless discernible in the president's speech, despite his programmed rebuke to them.

The public war among politicians sometimes gives victory to one of them, but more often history simply carries them all offstage...

Economic

TU Requests No Unprotected Firings

Moscow TRUD in Russian 1 Mar 91 p 1

[Report by M. Isakova from Press Center of General Confederation of Soviet Trade Unions: "Petition Submitted"]

[Text] The unprotected position of state employees in our country is the same as it was in the times of Akaky Akakievich in "The Overcoat." None of them knows today what will happen tomorrow, because, after all, the country's highest leadership promises every day to liquidate certain organizations of state administration.

So without waiting for this to happen, the Federation of Trade Unions of workers of state institutions of the

USSR have appealed to the chairman of the USSR Cabinet of Ministers V.S. Pavlov not to table a resolution to the USSR Supreme Soviet connected with liquidating organizations of state administration without first informing and negotiating with the trade unions to preserve the rights and interests of the workers. In this appeal the Trade Unions indicated that this request is well-founded. A corresponding norm is found in Article 8 of the USSR Law "On Trade Unions: The Rights and Guarantees of Their Activity."

The only thing that is not clear is why are the civil servants asking and not demanding. Do they really expect a positive decision on this issue because the prime minister is also a member of this Trade Union?

Soviet Miners Strike in Kuzbass Region

AU0403121091 Paris AFP in English 1139 GMT 4 Mar 91

[Text] Moscow, March 4 (AFP)—Miners from 24 coal pits in the Siberian Kuzbass region on Monday held a series of work stoppages to back demands for better living conditions and the resignation of the central government, local sources reported. This followed a series of similar stoppages on Friday and Saturday in other coal-mining regions of the country.

TASS news agency said that only three pits in the Kemerovo region of the Kuzbass had partially stopped work on Monday.

In the Donbass region of the Ukraine, six out of 250 pits were also on strike on Monday, along with one pit out of 49 in the Rostov-na-Donu region, TASS said.

Miners in some Kuzbass pits were holding three-hour stoppages at each shift, according to Dmitriy Shaguiachmetov, editor of "Our newspaper", contacted by telephone in Kemerovo.

Some 5,000 miners also held a rally in Prokopyevsk on Monday to call for the resignation of Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev, his cabinet and for the transfer of power to the Federation Council, a body which regroups the leaders of all the Soviet republics, TASS and local sources said.

27 Mines in Kuznetsk Basin Strike 4 Mar

LD0403153791 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1300 GMT 4 Mar 91

[Excerpts] Today is a troubled day in the Kuznetsk Basin. You probably know that the council of workers' committees has called for a political strike, relying mainly on miners' collectives. According to a TASS report, the working day at an absolute majority of over 100 coal enterprises of the coal center began as normal and work was only partially suspended at three collieries. In a word, this appeal has not been heeded. Is this the case? I address this question to Sergey Saltimakov, correspondent of the oblast television and radio committee. We have him on the telephone.

[Saltimakov] [passage omitted] Well, and now, all the same, on the scale of the strike in the Kuznetsk Basin in the language of figures. Here is information that I was informed of literally just before coming on the air by the oblast council of workers' committees: During the first shift 24 coal mining enterprises struck completely. In addition to this, a two-hour strike took place at the Baydayevskiy open-cast mine of the Berezovskaya colliery. Incidentally, it has been decided that there will be a three-hour strike each shift at this colliery, but two more collieries have completely stopped work for the second shift. Thus, 27 collieries are on strike. Sergey Saltimakov, Kemerovo, especially for Russia's Radio.

[Announcer] Thanks, Sergey. I will add to this report that in Vorkuta the strike by miners' collectives has been transferred to 6 and 7 March. However, unlike the Kuznetsk Basin, it will be of an economic nature. The miners are demanding the fulfillment of government decision No. 608.

Limited Support For Strike Among Kuzbass Miners

LD0403184691 Moscow Central Television Vostok Program and Orbita Networks in Russian 1530 GMT 4 Mar 91

[Report by unidentified correspondent, from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] The miners of the Kuznetsk basin had a difficult question to resolve today. As you know, it had been planned to hold a 24-hour political strike today. So they have been trying to decide whether to take part in it or to reject it. This time the long list of political ultimatums also contained economic demands. These include a pay raise for miners amounting to several times their present earnings, and the adoption of a law on price indexation.

[Unidentified correspondent] Like everyone in the oblast, they were impatiently awaiting news today—would the miners go to work? Even the day before, the collectives of many mines—Belovo, Kemerovo, (?Azhero-Suzhenskaya), Mezhdurechenskaya—did not support the strike.

The miners of all open-cast coal mines decided to go to work, and that is a third of the basin's output. But among the miners there were supporters of the strike, and there were waverers. There was faith in people's good sense. After all, the package of political demands presented by the leaders of the oblast workers' movement turned out to be very far from miners' vital concerns. The strike call was rejected by deputies at the oblast soviet; 136 of them voted against a ruinous strike, and only eight for the strike. An appeal to reason was made to the miners by delegates at the oblast congress of deputies from rural soviets, and by the church leaders of Kuzbass. This is not the time to strike. This further attempt to hamper the settlement of complex social programs in the oblast has to be rejected. The situation is indeed complex. The coal depots of the pits and mines are impoverished. In January and February they lost nearly 2,200,000 tonnes of output as compared with last year's level. Even today the miners are working at the 1966 level. The dispatch of coal is progressing unevenly, undermining confidence in Kuzbass in the business world and leading to serious material losses. Even in Kemerovo, at the end of February all of the town's thermal power stations were put on strict rations, and the temperature has been 25-30 degrees for four solid days. Yes, the miners have plenty of problems, their work is hard, and their pay is not so high. But things cannot be rectified by voluntary unemployment. The situation can only be rectified by productive work and a strengthening of labor discipline.

It is precisely these arguments—and they are shared by many in Kuzbass—that have won. As expected, the strike has not gained universal scope. The political games of its organizers have not won the support of the miners. Only a few mines out of 100 coal mining enterprises in the basin were not working today. The other pits and mines of Kuzbass were providing coal, as usual.

Miners at Pit in Donbass Decide To Strike

LD0503025891 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 2230 GMT 4 Mar 91

[Excerpts] Miners at the pit named after the 60th anniversary of the Leninist Komsomol, the largest pit in the Donbass, made a decision at a meeting on the morning of 4 March to temporarily halt the extraction of anthracite. [passage omitted] The decision to start a strike was made despite warnings from the pit administration that in the event of a halt in coal extraction, daily losses would amount to over 330,000 rubles. Out of 49 pits situated in Rostov Oblast, only the kollektiv at the (Zverevskaya) pit administration supported the strikers.

'Most' Mines Resume Normal Operations

LD0403214491 Moscow TASS in English 2030 GMT 4 Mar 91

[Text] Moscow March 4 TASS—Most mines in Soviet coal fields resumed normal operations today, with a few continuing on strike here and there.

From Vorkuta, TASS correspondent Vladimir Makarov reports that in the Pechora coal basin most mines operate rhythmically producing coal above plan since the beginning of March. But miners still demand direct talks between representatives of Vorkuta and Inta miners, builders and railway men and the Soviet Prime Minister, Valentin Pavlov.

They want direct talks to discuss their economic needs, including double pay rates, better adjusted tax rates on coal industry mines and enterprises, higher retirement pensions for those who live in the far north and other regions with harsh climates.

If the demand for direct talks is turned down, the Vorkuta and Inta miners intend to walk out on March 7. An urgent telegram saying this was sent on Sunday to President Mikhail Gorbachev, the leaders of the parliaments and governments, trade unions and economic management bodies of the Soviet Union, Russian Federation and Komi republic.

All mines have worked at a normal pace today in Karaganda (Kazakhstan), a TASS correspondent reports from the region. Talks have begun between representatives of work collectives, the government of Kazakhstan and the USSR coal ministry, cutting short the planned two-day strike.

According to the chairman of the Karaganda territorial miners' trade union council, Peter Schlegel, the strike has been suspended until March 30. Miners in the Karaganda coal fields, ranking third in the Soviet Union, demand higher wages and changes in taxation, the signing of a Union treaty and the promulgation of the law of the Kazakh republic on income indexation.

In Kuznetsk region (Siberia) the working day got off to a normal start at the majority of 100 coal enterprises. Miners at three collieries responded to the call of the Kuzbass work collective council to begin a political strike on Monday.

The council of workers' committees in Kuzbass encouraged workers to demand the resignation of the Soviet president and the union bodies of state authority and the transfer of power in the country to the Federation Council, the depoliticisation of the Interior Ministry troops, the KGB and the Army.

In Donetsk region, the situation has grown much more tense at local mines. Six mines in Krasnoarmeysk and Pervomaysk which slowed down production have been joined by Georgiy Dimitrov colliery's miners. More than half of underground workers have refused to report for work.

Miners in the city of Donetsk also announced stoppages. Work stopped completely at the Chelyuskintsy mine, and two out of eleven sections have stoped work at the Oktyabrskiy mining administration. Miners here continue pressing for their demands: immediate doubling of wage rates and better provisions for retired miners. Nine of the Ukraine's 249 mining work collectives stopped work partially or fully during the second shift on Monday.

Nikolay Volynko, member of the strike committee at the Donestkugol production association, told TASS that the strike began today because miners were displeased by the way the press covered the workers' movement and reported their demands. "Miners do not want to look like spongers ready to snatch a piece of bread from somebody else's mouth," as the press would paint them, he said.

Miners From 12 Donbass Facilities Go On Strike

LD0503111291 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1036 GMT 5 Feb 91

[By correspondents Nikolay Stolyarov and Vladimir Yurkevich]

[Text] Donetsk, 5 Mar (TASS)—The strike is continuing at a number of mines in the Donbass (southeast Ukraine). Its scale has expanded somewhat during the past 24 hours. According to the latest reports, 12 of almost 250 mines in this region of the southeast Ukraine have stopped work. Altogether, throughout the four days of the strike miners have been short in delivering 122,000 tonnes of coal. Miners are continuing to insist on the demands previously put forth: an immediate increase in wages by 2 or 2.5 times and regulation of pension legislation for miners.

Donbass Strike Committees Meet

LD0503135191 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1200 GMT 5 Mar 91

[Text] Our correspondent Gennadiy Kondaurov has just reported from Donetsk that four mines of the Krasnoarmeysk coal association are on strike for the fifth consecutive day. Among them are largest mines in the Ukraine—the Stakhanov mine and the Lyumanskaya mine. According to the information of the monitoring service of the Donbass coal industry, four more enterprises have stopped work. They are the Chelyuskintsev and Oktaybrskaya mines in Donbass and the Voroshilov and the Artem mines in the town of Dzerzhinsk. Miners are putting forward economic demands including salary increase and expansion of the list of mining professions entitled to a privileged pension. Strike committees are holding meetings in a number of Donbass towns today.

Miners Dissatisfaction Reportedly 'Growing'

LD0503134491 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1200 GMT 5 Mar 91

[Interview with USSR Coal Industry Minister M. Shchadov by correspondent A. Kolpakov on 5 March, place not given; from the "Television News Service" program—recorded]

[Excerpts] [Kolpakov] As distinct from the Donbass, the miners of Kuzbass have shifted their emphasis to political demands, at the heart of which lie the resignation of the government and also support for Boris Yeltsin's policies in his fight for the sovereignty of Russia. The focus of events on 4 March was Prokopyevsk, where 10 of the 15 mines stopped work and a large strike meeting was held on the town's main square. [passage omitted]

By the evening 27 mines were on strike. The beginning of March has shown that the workers' dissatisfaction is growing, and it could take the form of more strikes at any moment. [passage omitted]

It transpired this morning that six mines in Novokuznetsk have not ended their strike; the miners have decided to strike until their demands are met.

[Shchadov] We are saying bluntly that none of those who don't work today will get any pay. We won't make any amendments to the plans, and if anyone doesn't work this day, at the end of the month he will be punished with loss of seniority.

Scientific

Radiation Still High Near Chernobyl

PM0403143991 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 28 Feb 91 First Edition p 4

[Answer to reader's letter by Reserve Colonel V. Volshev, leader of a Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic State Committee for Hydrometeorology group coordinating work on radiological and ecological monitoring; first two paragraphs are reader's letter: "More on Background Radiation"]

[Text] "I have read some information in a 'briefing' about settlements in Belorussia that have a level of background radiation differing substantially from what occurs naturally. But what is the situation in the Ukraine?"

[Signed] N. Samsonenko, Fastov.

Reserve Colonel V. Volshev, leader of the Ukrainian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] State Committee for Hydrometeorology group coordinating work on radiological and ecological monitoring:

"The amount of work concerned with the radiological inspection of settlements in the Ukraine is increasingly sharply. Whereas in 1986-1989 around 70,000 homes were inspected, in 1990 alone 600,000 were examined. A total of 20 million rubles have been allocated for 1991 to carry out this work in the Ukraine as part of the union republic program. Large contracting organizations are in charge of the inspection and work.

In the vast majority of settlements the natural level of background gamma radiation has remained unchanged from the average on Ukrainian SSR territory of between 0.011 and 0.020 milliroentgens per hour. For example, there are no deviations from the natural background level in the areas of Volyn, Rovno, and other oblasts even more remote from nuclear power stations. It is not raised in Kiev city. But there are areas where the background radiation is increased a little since the Chernobyl accident: Zhitomir Oblast (e.g. in Korosten the level is 0.039), Chernigov Oblast, and Kiev Oblast. The level is high in the village of Polesskoye (Kiev Oblast), for example, reaching 0.150 milliroentgens per hour. Let me remind you that the background radiation in Bragin, Narovlya, and other settlements in Belorussia is several times higher."

Modernization of Communications Discussed

LD2802232791

[Editorial report] Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian, in its "Vremya" newscast at 1800 GMT on 28 February, carries a three-minute report by correspondent P. Orlov on the joint venture to modernize Soviet communication systems using the space and defense technology within the framework of conversion. The estimates show that at least 60 billion rubles are needed to bring the present outmoded and inefficient system up to the international level, but this figure will be 10 times lower if space technology is be used. The founders of the international innovation enterprise Koskon (Space Conversion) have already raised the necessary capital.

A.I. Ilyin, the project's chief constructor, says in an interview that the international innovation joint venture Koskom sees as its main task the creation of the global low-orbit satellite communications system for solving the information technology problems in various branches of the national economy."

K.I. Pobedonostsev, director of the experimental constructive bureau of the Moscow Energy Institute, says when interviewed: "We also hope to create the cheapest but most effective information system for education and other areas of social activity in our country, successfully and in the shortest possible time."

According to A.I. Dunayev, chief of the Glavkosmos: "If we are able to have a sufficiently cheap apparatus and the proper communications, the satellite itself and the rocket carrier will be a minimal expenditure, even in comparison with the existing expenditures."

V.I. Khokhlov, USSR deputy communications minister, says in an interview: "Today we can realistically speak about the competitive systems. And in this regard the Koskon system is remarkable—first of all because we see it as a system complementing the existing systems as well as the proposed systems we have, and we attach an important role to it."

In conclusion, correspondent Orlov says that if everything runs smoothly, people could be using the satellite telephone system within three years.

Military

Yazov Visits Western Group Forces

PM0503110591 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 5 Mar 91 First Edition p 1

[Correspondent Colonel V. Markushin report: "Visit to Western Group of Forces"]

[Text] Marshal of the Soviet Union D.T. Yazov, USSR minister of defense, visited the Western Group of Forces 2-3 March. During his brief stay in the Western Group of Forces the defense minister presented to a group of officers and generals orders and medals conferred upon them by a USSR presidential decree and addressed the officers of Wuensdorf Garrison.

In his speech Yazov characterized the political situation that has taken shape in the world in recent years and emphasized that its assessment must not be approached from positions of the old philosophy. He made a brief analysis of the events in the Persian Gulf zone from the viewpoint of their military-political lessons.

Dwelling on problems of strategic arms reduction, the defense minister pointed out that the Soviet side's approach to it is dictated by common sense and economic considerations. He emphasized the importance of strengthening the principle of the nonproliferation of nuclear weapons in the interests of worldwide security.

Concerning the Soviet troop withdrawal from Germany, Yazov said that it does not run counter to the Soviet Union's security interests. The defense minister spoke of what specifically is being done to increase housing construction and to provide apartments for servicemen's families in connection with the redeployment of Western Group of Forces units to the USSR.

Moiseyev Cited on 'Nuclear Parity'

PM0503140591 Moscow TRUD in Russian 5 Mar 91 p 3

[Interview with Army General M. Moiseyev, chief of General Staff of the USSR Armed Forces, by correspondent V. Badurkin; place and date not given; first paragraph is introduction: "Army General M. Moiseyev: Treaty With FRG Is Working"]

[Text] The USSR Supreme Soviet has embarked on the examination and ratification of a package of treaties and agreements between the USSR and the FRG, the key element being the treaty "on the terms for the temporary residence and planned withdrawal of Soviet troops from the territory of the FRG." Although the treaty has so far been ratified only by one side—the FRG—in reality its provisions have been "working" since October 1990. The five months since then make it possible to assess the effectiveness of the agreements which have been concluded. Our correspondent V. Badurkin talks about this with the chief of General Staff of the USSR Armed Forces.

[Badurkin] Mikhail Alekseyevich, before assess the effectiveness of the provisions of the treaty, please tell us what the Western Group of Forces is like.

[Moiseyev] The grouping of our forces in central Europe arose as a result of the defeat of fascism. It is the most powerful of our forces' groupings both in terms of its effective combat strength (six armies, including an air army) and in terms of its numerical strength (337,800 servicemen), weapons, level of skill, and degree of combat training. Here are just a few figures for the sake of clarity. The Western Group of Forces has 777 military townships, 47 airfields, and 59 testing grounds and drill fields. The overall value of its buildings and installations is 2.9 billion rubles.

[Badurkin] The treaty submitted for ratification is assessed differently by specialists and the public. That applies particularly to the schedule for our troops' withdrawal...

[Moiseyev] Yes, the schedule is indeed very tough. Incidentally, the General Staff counted on a minimum of about seven years. But life and the political realities of present-day Europe dictate their own terms. We were obliged to agree to the troops' withdrawal by the end of 1994. In all over the course of four years we will have to withdraw about 550,000 men, 114,000 units of equipment, and 1.5 million tonnes of material and technical stocks.

[Badurkin] And you believe you will be able to withdraw all that?

[Moiseyev] The General Staff has compiled a plan and schedule for the withdrawal of the Western Group of Forces. It has been coordinated and handed to the German side, as stipulated by the treaty, at the end of December 1990. With a consideration for the existing situation and the potential for the use of various types of transport, we have planned in each of the first three years to withdraw 30 percent of the troops and to withdraw the remaining 10 percent in the last year, 1994. Over 11,000 trains and 1,130 ship voyages will be needed for that.

[Badurkin] Recently the cost of rail shipments both in Germany and in Poland has increased substantially. In addition the stance taken by the Polish Government is impeding the transit of our troops' trains and motor vehicle convoys.

[Moiseyev] All this is giving us considerable additional worries. Some of the plan's provisions are having to be corrected on the move, so to speak. For instance, we have had to increase the volume of sea and air shipments. The main brunt has been borne by the forces of the Baltic Fleet and military transport aircraft and ships of the USSR Ministry of the Maritime Fleet.

Today these questions have already been resolved. In addition the German side has agreed to finance transport not to its own ports, as previously planned, but to Soviet ports. As far as the Poles are concerned I personally believe they will review their position. After all at present their railroads are not fully loaded. In any case we shall fulfill the withdrawal plan. That is borne out by the fact that despite all kinds of difficulties as of 1 March we had withdrawn about 44,000 servicemen, 3,849 tanks, 1,746 combat vehicles, and 988 guns and mortars from the Western Group of Forces.

[Badurkin] One of the most acute problems connected with the troops' withdrawal is the housing problem...

[Moiseyev] Yes, that is indeed the main problem. The troops from Hungary and Czechoslovakia went to virtually all the garrisons where there were free stocks or where the density could be increased. All possible measures are now being taken to provide normal facilities for the units being withdrawn from the Western Group of Forces and to organize their planned combat training.

Matters are more complicated with regard to housing for officers and ensigns. We need about 54,000 apartments for family men and hostels for 13,000 bachelors. As you can see, the agreement with the German side to construct 36,000 apartments at its expense does not solve the problem. To this end a "Conversion-housing" consortium has been formed under the USSR Defense Ministry, including eight plants of the Western Group of Forces with the subsequent participation of the German firm "Bison Werke" in the matter. We are also hoping for assistance from the organs of power at the units' new places of deployment.

[Badurkin] You have outlined far from all the problems that have to be resolved during the withdrawal. It is primarily the Defense Ministry that will have to resolve them. During the discussion of the treaties many of your colleagues subjected them to serious criticism. Some suggested being in no hurry with the ratification. What is the position of the chief of General Staff?

[Moiseyev] Alongside the Foreign Ministry, Ministry of Foreign Economic Relations, and other interested departments, the Defense Ministry also took an active part in preparing the treaties and agreements. Of course not all, but many, of our proposals and wishes were taken into account. I would not say that all provisions of the documents that have been signed are irreproachable or suit us. But as a whole I want to stress that in the entire package of questions that were examined a big step has been taken in the full regulation of relations with Germany. Here are just a few specific examples. The treaties enshrine Germany's definitive borders. It has been emphasized that combat operations will never be launched in future from its territory. A "ceiling" has been set for the bundeswehr—370,000 men. The package of agreements develops and strengthens trust between our countries and maintains peace and stability in Europe.

Of course, this will seem too little for some of our citizens, especially the front line veterans. I have received proposals, even demands, to use the right of the victory state, right up to dictating our terms. From a purely human viewpoint I understand these people and share their pain and anxiety. But from the viewpoint of large-scale political and with a consideration for the realities of existing interstate relations, we could not travel that path. I believe the package of treaties must be ratified. Another question is the development and tuning of the mechanism for their implementation. That is what we must think about now above all.

[Badurkin] Considering the experience of withdrawing troops from Hungary and Czechoslovakia, it may be supposed that the property question will become a very vexed one.

[Moiseyev] That is precisely what I am saying. By agreement between the USSR and FRG governments, the determination of the composition, cost, and form of sale of immovable property which we one is being implemented by a Soviet-German commission specially created for the purpose. Its chairman on our side is K.F. Katushev, USSR minister of foreign economic relations. It is five months since the treaty and agreement were signed but to this day the commission has not finished work on the procedure for selling this property. For instance, in the first quarter of this year the Group announced the handing over of 35 military townships and 44 buildings to the German side. But this property is not being sold. The buildings and installations which have been handed over remain essentially ownerless and are being plundered and are falling into disuse.

Matters are no better regarding mobile property. As of today a contract has been signed only for the sale of lignite and coal dust to the sum of about 0.5 million marks. And in the Western Group of Forces we have much that it is by no means compulsory (and which is indeed disadvantageous) to export into the union: scrap metal, fuel and lubricants, motor transport assets, engineering, chemical, armored, and other equipment.

There are great complications with regard to the sale of capital facilities. The point is that under international laws (including FRG laws) the owner of immobile property is the owner of the land, and naturally Germany has no intention of selling land to us or to other countries. It is essential urgently to seek partners, mainly from among FRG citizens and firms. According to my information, those who want to conclude contracts with us and even to create joint ventures in Germany do exist. It is up to the efficiency of Soviet specialists and primarily the specialists of the Ministry of Foreign Economic Relations. But as it happens there are few of them in the Western Group of Forces, and those who are there as a rule stay only for a while.

Our thriftlessness, inefficiency, and bad management could do a "good service" to the German side's desire to obtain the maximum profit and could leave us looking like fools, so to say.

[Badurkin] And one last question, but an important one for us all. We asserted for a long time that the Western Group of Forces was our outpost, our shield against NATO. How will its abolition affect the USSR's defense capability?

[Moiseyev] Of course, such events cannot pass without leaving a trace or painlessly. I repeat that the Western Group of Forces is our most powerful and combat-capable grouping. But I do not think the situation should be dramatized. First, in shifting to a defensive doctrine we have taken a number of specific strategic steps which will make it possible to reduce the negative consequences of the elimination of our foreign groups of forces. In particular new groupings of ground forces, air defense, and the air force are being created in regions adjacent to our Western borders. Second, we hope that the NATO leaders' peace-loving statements will not remain on paper alone. Third, and that is the main thing, our state's defense capability is ensured by nuclear parity with the West and here so far everything is in order.

Colonel Reviews Iraqi Weaponry Effectiveness

LD0403234791 Moscow International Service in Arabic 1500 GMT 4 Mar 91

[Commentary by military observer Colonel Vadim Solovyov]

[Text] Among the various topics being discussed at the end of the war in the Gulf region is the subject of comparing military and technical capabilities and the type of weapons of both sides. Here is the opinion of our military observer Col. Vadim Solovyov:

The victory of the multinational forces indicates which side was superior in the military-technical aspect. The forces of the United States of America, Britain and other NATO countries considered the war as an opportunity to test the most advanced types of weaponry. The most advanced aircraft, undetectable by radar, were used for the first time. Winged missiles, tomahawks, fuel bombs, laser-guided missiles and other examples of the most advanced achievements in the field of weapon technology was used.

Was it possible for Iraq to manufacture something to counter that? Naturally not. I believe that the calculations were based on the assumption that the lag in scientific field could be compensated somehow by piles of arms purchased from France, Belgium and the rest of the Western countries, and, first of all, from the Soviet Union. These weapons basically consisted of missiles, aircraft and tanks.

We do not at all share Saddam Husayn's choice of targets for his Soviet weapons. He acquired them for defensive purposes only. It is well known that the Soviet Union stopped all military shipments to Iraq and withdrew its military experts, in condemnation of the aggression on Kuwait. It is still possible to draw a few conclusions as long as the weapon was used in combat operations.

The air defense systems were not sufficiently effective. However, we must consider that they were not designed, in terms of technical capabilities, to stand against the most powerful American air fleet. On the other hand, we should also consider the level of training for operating the air defense weapon.

The West German companies and other companies introduced a number of modifications to Scud missiles in the Iraqi samples and that produced something new.

The Patriot missiles which intercepted them were manufactured two decades later and were equipped with the most complicated electronics. They are far superior to Scud missiles technically. Still, it seems that whoever hoped for a near total interception of Scud missiles in the air can only feel disappointed because the interception rate in the air was not 100 percent, but only 50 percent.

Comparison is difficult in regard to tanks and aircraft, since they belong to a totally different technical generations. The most advanced tank on the Iraqi side was the T-72, manufactured twenty years ago. The American side has armored vehicles based on the latest military achievements. Practically no air combat took place, because the Iraqi air force was paralyzed on the ground during the first hours of the war.

Radio Moscow military observer Col. Vadim Solovyov concluded his comment by saying that weapon alone does not solve battle tasks. It is the people who operate it. The level of training of the soldiers of the anti-Iraq coalition and their combat morale were much higher than that of the Iraqis. They also had the feeling that Saddam Husayn's military adventure, in the shadow of his total international isolation, was doomed to utter failure.

Navy Chief Chernavin Addresses Writers

PM0403141991 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 2 Mar 91 First Edition p 3

[Report by Captain First Rank A. Pilipchuk under "[illegible] Line" rubric: "Navy Invites Friends"]

[Text] Moscow—The Navy is one of the five services of the USSR Armed Forces. However, its specificity lies in the fact that it is a complex conglomerate incorporating part of all these services. The Navy has ICBM's, seaborne aviation, naval infantry, and air defense means. Finally, the Navy has something that the other services do not have—submarines, surface vessels, and support ships.

The meeting of Admiral of the Fleet V. Chernavin, commander in chief of the Navy, with writers on naval and army themes and representatives of the mass media opened with his account of the current naval forces and resources. Writers and poets, TASS, IZVESTIYA, PRAVDA, RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA, TRUD, SOVETSKAYA KULTURA, SELSKAYA ZHIZN, MORSKOY SBORNIK, and SOVETSKIY MORYAK (Leningrad naval base) correspondents, deputy chief commanders, admirals and officers of the Navy were gathered in the Navy Military Council hall of sessions. Preparations for the tercentenary of the establishment of our state's Navy provided the pretext for the meeting.

The Navy, just like the rest of the country, is going through a complex period in its history. As part of the cuts in the defense appropriations 40 percent of scientific development work in the Navy, for example, has been discontinued, and this may seriously affect the future of the fleet. During the fall draft the Navy failed to enlist 6,000 draftees, and around 1,000 servicemen have left their units without authorization, complying with the "laws of their republics." Nonetheless, the Navy has managed to maintain its organizational standard and combat capability and is discharging its tasks in a worthy fashion.

The writers on themes relating to the Armed Forces are also experiencing many problems. Most publications are reluctant today to publish material on patriotic themes on their pages, while articles in which the history and current conditions in the Army and Navy are represented in a crooked mirror, as it were, enjoy the most favorable of conditions. All speakers at the meeting noted this with alarm. The exchange of opinions which took place at the meeting is called upon to boost joint work toward resolving all these problems.

Baltic Republics

Landsbergis Holds News Conference 4 Mar

LD0503054491

[Editorial Report] Vilnius Radio Vilnius in Lithuanian at 1830 GMT on 4 March carries a 63-minute news conference held at the Lithuanian Supreme Council by Lithuanian delegates to the Nordic Council and Vytautas Landsbergis, chairman of the Lithuanian Supreme Council.

The news conference starts with Bronislovas Kuzmickas, deputy chairman of the Lithuanian Supreme Council, reporting on the results of the Nordic Council session devoted to debate about the Baltics. Other delegates also voice their opinions on the issues discussed at the session.

Following the reports by members of the Lithuanian delegation to the Nordic Council session, Landsbergis says: "It would be better to say that the issues not one of how to internationalize the problem of the Baltic states, but how to prevent the Soviet from nationalizing it, because the Baltic problem is already an international problem, but they would prefer very much to present it as an internal problem." He adds: "I would say that we have won this political-diplomatic encounter."

Landsbergis notes: "Accepting that the Baltic countries are not a Soviet internal matter, the continuing actions of pressure and intimidation should be seen in a different light. The demand to conduct a referendum on the Soviet Union looks like a very strange phenomenon if one looks at the absurdity of the question posed to the people." He adds: "I do not know who twisted this question in such an artful way, but it is absurd. Demanding that the Baltic states organize this referendum here is both politically and legally unfounded. However, attempting to organize some kind of voting willfully may cause certain tensions. Indeed, such a regulation has been approved by Moscow, which says that any enterprise or party organization may organize the polling and this organization should be registered in Moscow as the election commission. This is interference into the internal affairs of Lithuania. We have stated before and we will say this in more strict terms once again."

Landsbergis states: "If explosions of bombs start at night in Vilnius, then this will be a sign that violence on a larger scale is being prepared. Most probably the other side will label it as ensuring the conditions for holding the referendum. Here our relations with the Soviet Union may acquire some additional tension. There is already tension after the January events, since the culprits have not been punished." He notes: "Not a single soldier has been withdrawn from Lithuania, except some units were replaced by others. Currently, new units are being drawn into Lithuania. Their purpose is not known. Not a single occupied building has been returned, and not a single act of robbery had been compensated." He adds: "I hope that attempts for destabilization, and we have already seen a considerable number of these, will fail this time too."

Following this, V. Landsbergis says that no reply has been received from the Soviet side concerning the renewal of negotiations. He says: "Sometimes were receive an answer to statements of good will, then this is regretable indeed."

This was followed by questions to V. Landsbergis. The first question is whether it is a good idea to have representatives from the Nordic countries present at the negotiations with the Soviet Union. Landsbergis says this is a very good idea, adding: "If the Soviets show a sign of good will, say returning an occupied building or stopping the demonstration of military might, then it will be worth while talking, as even a partial advance is useful."

Asked if Lithuania could expect more support now that the Gulf crisis is over, Landsbergis says: "Lithuania has its own type of strategic oil, which is its position by the Baltic Sea. This is why the Soviet Union is so interested in banning the restoration of Lithuania's independence."

Answering a question about the results of the Estonian and Latvian referenda, Landsbergis says the results are very good. Answering a question on the Baltic Council, Landsbergis says a sitting is to be held, most likely this week. He says: "We must coordinate our positions, especially now that plebiscite has been held. The results of the referendum are similiar, which gives grounds for strengthening our common political position, and we will do this."

Answering a question on the Union treaty, Landsbergis says: "The USSR referendum will indeed be linked with the draft Union treaty, which has been coordinated by eight Soviet republics and a by a certain number of autonomous republics. It has been mailed. Today it reached us." He notes: "The secession of members of the Union was not included in the previous draft. Now it is mentioned as a possibility—free secession from the Union—but it is clear what kind of freedom this is, because the procedure of the secession is defined by all the members of the Union. Still, when this is defined, how and by what majority of votes remains unknown. This means, in essence, that someone who signs a treaty finds that he can join, but if he changes his mind, then is not known what the conditions for leaving are. One gets inside, locks the door, and throws away the key through the window with iron bars."

Landsbergis Comments on USSR Referendum

LD0403161691 Vilnius Radio Vilnius in Lithuanian 0700 GMT 4 Mar 91

[Text] I would like to read the commentary by Supreme Council Chairman Vytautas Landsbergis on voting in Lithuania which was given to us by the Supreme Council Information Bureau. It reads as follows:

Lithuania does not take part in voting and referendums announced by other states but assists their citizens if a desire is expressed for them to express their will.

During its presidential election, Poland had designated its ad hoc consul for Lithuania for this purpose.

The authorized Latvian representative to Lithuania could have arranged for his citizens' referendum vote in local municipal government offices.

To date, no request has been received, either from the USSR Government or USSR republic governments, regarding the USSR citizens' referendum announced for 17 March even though certain organizations in Lithuania are encouraged to willfully carry out the USSR CPSU's directives on this issue.

This constitutes rude and unwarranted interference in Lithuania's internal affairs. It is an attempt to incite unrest and to destabilize the political situation, notes Landsbergis' commentary.

On the other hand, the question proposed for the Soviet referendum is so absurd that it would be possible to completely ignore its content. The question, do you wish to preserve that which does not exist?—some type of genuine union, genuine federation—which we have not yet [word indistinct] today. That which may or may not exist in the future is a typical relic of communist mythology. Unless, perhaps, the vote would demonstrate how many individuals still exist in Lithuania who blindly believe the CPSU nightingales.

However, no one will prevent the willful vote organizers from tossing in as many ballots as desired. They will obtain 99.9 percent or perhaps even 200 percent of the population's vote.

This type of vote is insignificant, just as all [word indistinct] the voting sessions conducted by the communists from 1940-1989 have been.

This was a commentary by Lithuanian Supreme Council Chairman, Vytautas Landsbergis concerning voting in Lithuania.

Lithuanian CP Official on Holding Referendum

LD0203220391 Moscow TASS in English 1751 GMT 2 Mar 91

[By TASS correspondent Serafim Bukhun]

[Text] Vilnius March 2 TASS—"Despite the statement of the Lithuanian leadership concerning the all-Union referendum which says that 'starting from March 11, 1990, no Soviet laws or resolutions of Soviet authorities are valid in Lithuania and obligatory to its people', the referendum will still be held in the republic." Algimantas Naudzunas, secretary of the Central Committee of the Lithuanian Communist Party, told TASS.

In accordance with resolutions of the Soviet parliament of January 16 and February 25, this year, he continued, constituencies, polling stations and electoral commissions are being created at enterprises and institutions of Union subordination, as well as in Army units deployed in Lithuania. This is being done by labour collectives and public associations.

In addition, a coordinating council has been created at the Lithuanian Congress of Democratic Forces, which will render practical assistance to regional and district electoral commissions during the preparation and holding of the referendum.

Baltic Representatives Meet With UK's Major

LD0503143291 Tallinn Domestic Service in Estonian 1300 GMT 5 Mar 91

[Text] This morning at 0800 a meeting took place between permanent representatives of the Baltic states and John Major, British prime minister, who is on a one-day visit to Moscow. Preparing to meet USSR president Mikhail Gorbachev and USSR Prime Minister Valentin Pavlov, Major expressed interest in the situation in the Baltic states, in relations with the USSR Central Government, and in forms of support from Western states for the restoration of independence in the Baltics. Representatives of the Baltic states thanked the British Government for its prompt and effective support when the bloody events occurred in January this year.

The plebiscite that has taken place in the Baltic states demonstrates clearly what the standpoint of the majority of the population is on the issue of state independence. The current political situation in the USSR, however, is not favorable for recognizing the independence of the Baltic states. To place the issue of the restoration of the Baltic states' independence within the context of World War II serves as a realistic foundation to allow for our problems to be viewed as an issue at the international level. In this connection it is completely logical that Western states exert certain pressure on the USSR Central Government in order to open negotiations concerning the status of the Baltic states as states. Understanding the complexity of the situation, the Baltic side is ready for certain compromises on issues dealing with the USSR Army and economic relations. Understandably, this is not easy, as the bloodshed carried out in Lithuania and Latvia with the knowledge of the USSR Central Government and the continuing demonstrations of force have lost the people's trust in the USSR leadership's ability to reach sensible solutions.

John Major confirmed a continuation of the nonrecognition policy with regard to the Baltic states. He expressed readiness to raise the issue of starting negotiations at his meeting with the USSR political leadership. Taking the complexity of the situation into account, Major recommended that we advance cautiously, avoiding any possible conflicts. This may seem to be slowing down but it will ensure Western support. I think that this currently is the best way to achieve the goal, Major said.

We received this information from Juri Kahn, Estonian permanent representative, immediately after his meeting with John Major. Also present at the meeting were Egidijus Bickauskas, Lithuanian representative in Moscow, and Janis Peters, representative of the Baltic republic in Moscow. [sentence as heard]

Lithuanian Delegate Comments

LD0503102291 Vilnius Radio Vilnius in Lithuanian 0800 GMT 5 Mar 91

[Telephone interview with Egidijus Bickauskas, Lithuanian government representative in Moscow, by unidentified announcer on the Baltic representatives' meeting with UK Prime Minister John Major in Moscow on 5 March—live or recorded]

[Text] [Bickauskas] UK Prime Minister John Major, the representaives of Latvia and Estonia in Moscow, and the UK ambassador participated in the discussions.

[Announcer] Where did the conversation take place?

[Bickauskas] At the British Embassy. During the conversation, at Mr. Major's request , I described the present situation in Lithuania and relations with Lithuania and the USSR and their prospects. Views were exchanged on possible ways of consolidating Lithuania's independence, and Mr. Major stressed that Great Britain would also, in the future, steadfastly support the strivings of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia and that this would be one of the main topics in today's talks with the USSR leaders. The representatives of Latvia and Estonia also submitted their assessments. The conversation lasted about one hour. I would like to note that Mr. Major came to Moscow for a very brief visit, for only one day. The fact that his first meeting was with the representatives of the Baltic states, I think, represents an important political step. Mr. Major will meet with the USSR President at 1100 and later will meet with Prime Minster Pavlov and Defense Minister Yazov.

[Announcer] What are your personal impressions about his attitude toward Lithuania's affairs?

[Bickauskas] Mr. Major made a very pleasant impression; he is a very pleasant and likeable person, and his view toward the independence of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia corresponds with the views of the majority of the great Western powers. They approve of unconditional independence and approve of our aims. They have stressed this more than once in their relations with the USSR. They will constantly stress the need to [words indistinct] our aims and will apply efforts to implement them. If, in the future, assistance in some form is rendered to the Soviet Union, and I speak about the concrete situation, I am convinced that one of the conditions to render this assistance would be for the Soviet Union to seek ways of restoring and consolidating our independence.

Lithuanian Representative to USSR Cabinet Named

PM0403131991 Vilnius EKHO LITVY in Russian 21 Feb 91 p 1

[Unattributed "Chronicle" report]

[Text] The Lithuanian Republic Government has appointed Egidijus Vytauto Bickauskas permanent representative of the Lithuanian Republic Government at the USSR Cabinet of Ministers.

Nordic Countries Warned on Baltic Interference

PM0403122091 Stockholm SVENSKA DAGBLADET in Swedish 28 Feb 91 p 8

[Elisabeth Crona report: "Secret Soviet Warning to the Nordic Countries"]

[Text] Copenhagen—In a secret so-called demarche, delivered simultaneously in all the Nordic capitals, the Soviet Union has warned the Nordic countries against interfering in the Baltic question.

The communication from Moscow—which SVENSKA DAGBLADET has seen—is sharp in tone: It speaks clearly of a "rift in relations" between the Soviet Union and "Northern Europe."

The exact wording of this passage is:

"We do not want the rift which has arisen in the last few months in our relations with Northern Europe to be widened as a result of irresponsible remarks and actions from certain politicians and government representatives who are trying, as we see it, to solve their own problems, including internal problems, at our expense."

It is the invitation to the Baltic states to attend the Nordic Council's session in Copenhagen which has given rise to the Soviet anger. Russia and Soviet Karelia, for example, should have been invited too.

In a direct reference to the Nordic Council the communication declares that the Soviet Union has come to the conclusion that "not everyone has used the ties (between the Nordic Council and the Supreme Soviets of the Union and of individual republics) in an honorable way. Also, a politicization of the cooperation through these channels is taking place, as a result of which Russian and the Karelian Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic, for example, are being artificially pushed aside.

"How else," Moscow asks, "should one interpret the fact that representatives of the Baltic republics have been invited as guests to the Nordic Council's session to discuss practical cooperation, but that at the same time approaches from the Russian Federation have been rejected?

"The Soviet Union will proceed from the following point: He who fans the flame of separatism in the USSR does not want good relations with the Soviet Union but wishes instead to undermine them. With such an attitude, we cannot build a new European order and a new type of international relations."

The demarche, which was described as urgent, was delivered on Monday afternoon [25 February] to the Swedish Foreign Ministry and also to the other Nordic parliaments. In Sweden too it should have gone to the Riksdag speaker, but because the Riksdag is closed this week it was handed over to the Foreign Ministry instead. That is why the Foreign Ministry has informed the Swedish delegation to the Nordic Council of the contents of the communication.

It was not translated, but in Russian, and Stockholm Embassy First Secretary Tatapintsev delivered it to the Foreign Ministry. It has no rubric and is unsigned. Tatapintsev said that the "message" should have been delivered to Riksdag Speaker Thage G. Peterson by Ambassador Uspenskiy.

In the demarche Moscow expresses "concern" that the positive trend since the CSCE meeting in Paris is being broken by a "unilateral, distorted, and sometimes even irresponsible assessment" of events in the Baltic region.

"It is possible to wonder whether it will be easier to avoid explosions if foreign oil is poured into the fire of confrontation which has arisen in a number of regions of the USSR, including the Baltic."

The Swedish Foreign Ministry said that the key sentences in the demarche from the Soviet Union display throughout an older-style linguistic usage.

When the Nordic prime ministers voiced their reactions Monday evening it was not only a TIDNINGARNAS TELEGRAMBYRA report that they were commenting on but also on a much stronger diplomatic signal from the Soviet Union. However, none of them said a word about this. Poul Schluter did speak openly about "threats." However, Ingvar Carlsson was unwilling to describe the pressure as threats. The Nordic Council decides for itself what it debates, he said.

Finnish Prime Minister Harri Holkeri views the Nordic countries' statements in support of peaceful developments in the Baltic region as "moderate." Gro Harlem Brundtland called the statement from Moscow as reported in the published report as "views and wishes."

But the secret communication which also went to Anker Jorgensen (Social Democrat) in his capacity as chairman of the Nordic Council Presidium is much sharper in tone.

According to information given to SVENSKA DAGBLADET, the Nordic countries will probably not respond to the communication.

"I have nothing to add to my comments on Monday evening," Anker Jorgensen told SVENSKA DAGBLADET.

At the time of the warnings from Moscow, Baltic Presidents Arnold Ruutel and Anatolijs Gorbunovs and Vice President Bronislavas Kuzmickas have been in Copenhagen listening to the Nordic Council's debates and holding talks with leading Nordic politicians. Yesterday morning they held a news conference lasting over an hour and in the evening they spoke in the Folketing chamber after the Nordic Council had ended the day's meeting.

Nordic Countries Urged To Push Baltics Forum

PM0403120691 Copenhagen BERLINGSKE TIDENDE in Danish 28 Feb 91 p 4

[Terkel Svensson and Jorn Mikkelsen report: "Balts On the Podium"]

[Text] The three Baltic countries are calling on the Nordic area to work for an international conference to bring independence to Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania.

Such a conference should be seen not as interference in internal Soviet affairs but, on the contrary, as a helping hand to Moscow in the search for a solution to the Baltic question.

Finally, there should be an independent international investigation into Soviet violations of human rights in the Baltic region. This could be carried out under UN auspices.

That was the message from three prominent representatives of the Baltic countries who were unusually allotted time yesterday to speak on the fringes of the Nordic Council session, when the session was formally suspended.

In an initial reaction, Foreign Minister Uffe Ellemann-Jensen (Liberal) yesterday evening voiced interest in the proposals. He said that they will be discussed at the next meeting of Nordic foreign ministers 21 March.

None of the Nordic parliamentarians present in the Folketing chamber voiced any reaction to the Baltic proposals.

To a standing ovation from the delegates to the 39th session of the Nordic Council, Estonian President Arnold Ruutel, Latvian President Anatolijs Gorbunovs, and Lithuanian Vice President Bronislovas Kuzmickas entered the Folketing chamber at 1730 yesterday after Nordic Council President Anker Jorgensen had brought the expectant delegates to order.

The Balts have been invited only as guests and do not have the right to address the Nordic Council. That is why an organizational trick was necessary to give the Baltic envoys a chance to speak. As a result the meeting turned into a strong symbolic demonstration of what several speakers described as close ties between the Nordic area and the Baltic region.

Some parliamentarians, including some of the Nordic prime ministers, were seen to be absent, but spokesmen for the groups from the various Nordic countries said that this was not a political signal. Danish Prime Minister Poul Schluter (Conservative) listened intently to the speakers from his seat in the body of the chamber.

Swedish Moderate Coalition Party leader Carl Bildt called the meeting, which has caused great indignation in Moscow, a "milestone in the history of the Nordic Council."

President Anker Jorgensen declared that in the last few years the Nordic area has rediscovered the Baltic countries:

"Since 1940 we have probably had a tendency to forget your countries' existence. But now you are here. That is clear," Anker Jorgensen said in his warm speech of welcome.

Anatolijs Gorbunovs from Latvia stressed that a protest against the Soviet Union's use of force in the Baltic countries is not only the business of the Baltic region:

"The sharp condemnation of violence voiced by the West not only prevented the use of further force in the Baltic states, but also slowed down the trend toward dictatorship in the Soviet Union," he said.

He pointed out that the Soviet leadership must be made fully aware that the Nordic parliaments dissociate themselves from the use of military force in the Baltic region.

Lithuania's Bronislovas Kuzmickas pointed to Iceland, which has taken the first steps toward granting Lithuania diplomatic recognition:

"I hope that the other Nordic countries will follow this example," he said.

Estonia's Arnold Ruutel stressed that the CSCE process has no meaning if there is no normalization of the situation in the Baltic region. He pointed out that the question of the democratization of the Baltic countries is linked to internal developments in the Soviet Union.

At a news conference earlier yesterday the three Baltic representatives also wished it to be possible to exchange students.

"That would be the most valuable intellectual investment that the Nordic countries could offer the Baltic countries," Gorbunovs said.

Sweden Opens Information Bureaus in Baltics

LD0203044591 Moscow TASS in English 2045 GMT 1 Mar 91

[By TASS correspondent Vladimir Beskromniy]

[Text] Bratislava March 1 TASS—The Swedish Government supports in principle the striving of the Baltic republics for independence, but it is guided by the existing international agreements on the recognition of independence, said Swedish Minister of Justice Laila Freivalds at a press conference here today.

Lars-Ake Nilsson, Swedish ambassador to Czechoslovakia who took part in the press conference, added that Sweden was opening information bureaus in Vilnius, Riga and Tallinn, which would "partially act as consular missions." According to Nilsson, the Baltic republics are creating similar bureaus in Stockholm. The Swedish side intends to take part in financing them.

Lithuanian Minister Visits Denmark

LD0203230691 Vilnius Radio Vilnius in Lithuanian 1700 GMT 28 Feb 91

[Text] Foreign Minister of the Republic of Lithuania Algirdas Saudargas has arrived on a working visit to Copenhagen. He will meet with Danish Foreign Minister Uffe Elleman-Jensen. They will deal with problems of bilateral relations proposed for discussion in a letter from the Lithuanian Foreign Ministry to the Danish Foreign Ministry. It is expected that the ministers of both states will sign a protocol of cooperation between the Kingdom of Denmark and the Republic of Lithuania. The protocol describes the principles of bilateral cooperation and expresses resolute support by Denmark for the Lithuanian state in consolidating its independence.

Lithuanian Party Urges Flexibility Toward USSR

LD0303133391 Vilnius International Service in Lithuanian 0100 GMT 3 Mar 91

[Text] The Lithuanian Democratic Labor Party Council has urged adoption of a more flexible, diplomatic, and compromise recognizing policy toward the Soviet Union. To form, as soon as possible, an economic agreement with it for the current year, and to seek the regulation of relations with the Soviet Army in Lithuania.

The Lithuanian Democratic Labor Party Council's theses, which have been published in the press, assert that the danger of the conservative forces in Lithuania has not been assessed on the road to democracy and independence. The principle of the separation of powers has not been attained, laws are being issued in a chaotic fashion, constraints upon freedom of the press are attempted, and concern by the intelligentsia over the anti-democratic phenomena in Lithuanian political existence is being ignored, even condemned.

In the document, which has been published in the newspaper TIESA, the position of the party leadership is explained on, among other things, what should be accorded the greater portion of the parliament's attention as soon as possible.

First, [attention should be given] to the concept of state restoration and privatization, renouncing the ideologized view and satisfaction of group interests, and also to agrarian reform.

With this document, the Lithuanian Democratic Labor Party, formerly the Lithuanian Communist Party, is giving notice that it will soon establish a labor faction in place of the parliamentary leftist faction, which will strengthen ties with the parliament and the government leadership.

Various information available points to the fact that following Algirdas Brazauskas' loss of his post as deputy prime minister under the first government, the Democratic Labor Party is now rallying its forces.

Additionally, a republic-wide conference of all deputy members of this party will be held in Vilnius next Wednesday. Up to last year, an analogous conference had been held only by the Lithuanian Sajudis.

OMON 'Stepping Up' Actions in Lithuania

PM0103165591 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 1 Mar 91 p 2

[BALTFAX report under general heading "'Guards' Attack TV"]

[Text] Fifteen armed OMON [Special Purpose Militia Unit] men and five plainclothesmen burst into a building near Plunge (in the west of Lithuania) from where television programs were being relayed. The men who burst in, on the pretext of searching for weapons, severed telephone communications and forced the duty officer up against the wall. Some time later the OMON men left in automobiles.

Audrius Ajubalis, Lithuanian Supreme Soviet press spokesman, said at a briefing on Wednesday that "this is a sign that the OMON is once again stepping up its actions."

According to some reports, the OMON will replace USSR MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs] Internal Troops at the captured Vilnius television center and television tower as of 1 March.

Increased Military Presence Noted

LD0403165291 Vilnius Radio Vilnius in Lithuanian 1500 GMT 4 Mar 91

[Text] Activities by soldiers of the USSR Armed Forces have become more pronounced in Vilnius in recent days. They again patrolled the streets of the republic's capital on Saturday and Sunday.

About 1800 on Sunday, a large patrol attempted to enter the Supreme Council Building area but they were confronted at the barricades on Gediminas Prospect by men of the Lithuanian Defense Department. A conflict did not take place. The patrolling soldiers went back.

In Rudiskes, Trakay Rayon, approximately 100 pieces of combat equipment and maintenance equipment have been unloaded from rail flatcars.

The movement of military equipment was also observed in other areas.

This information was released by Lithuanian Supreme Council press representative Audrius Azubalis at a briefing today at the Supreme Council.

Prunskiene, Jurkans Doubt Gorbachev Reform Success

PM0503113791 Stockholm SVENSKA DAGBLADET in Swedish 3 Mar 91 p 10

[TIDNINGARNAS TELEGRAMBYRA report: "'Don't Support Gorbachev'"]

[Text] Sweden and other Western countries must come to realize that Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev's authority and power base are not what they were, Baltic politicians visiting Stockholm said yesterday.

Their view is: Support instead the democratic forces—then the Soviet leadership will be forced to abandon its illusions that Soviet power can be reestablished.

Former Lithuanian Prime Minister Kazimiera Prunskiene and Latvian Foreign Minister Janis Jurkans consider that Western support for Gorbachev the man cannot save the policy of reform. Both were visiting Stockholm at the weekend to take part in the meeting of the Liberal International. In interviews with TIDNINGARNAS TELEGRAMBYRA both politicians were agreed that there are other paths that Sweden and other Western countries can take.

"Today, when Gorbachev has betrayed democracy and joined the conservatives, such support is devastating for the democratic forces. I believe that the democratic process should be helped regardless of who is leading it," Janis Jurkans said.

Is there a chance that Gorbachev could again find the right road?

"Not any more. He is more concerned with the problems of the power struggle than with concrete results in the economic and democratic fields. It is my personal guess that he cannot go back," said Janis Jurkans, whose homeland, like Estonia, will hold an independence referendum Sunday [3 March]. In Latvia half the population is non-Latvian, the majority of these being Russian.

"I am very optimistic. In the past two elections we have already shown that two-thirds of the country is in favor of independence. This means that at least 25 percent of those who are not Latvians also vote 'yes' to independence."

Kazimiera Prunskiene resigned in January from the post of Lithuanian prime minister after clashing with President Vytautas Landsbergis.

She dismissed the rumors that her breakneck trip abroad after her resignation was also a farewell to politics.

"I have not left politics—quite the reverse. I now represent a social-liberal movement which will hopefully be able to form a party in opposition to the government within a few months."

She said that she has political ambitions, but finds it difficult to envisage any close cooperation with Landsbergis.

"We have completely different views on a series of foreign and domestic issues."

Prunskiene agrees entirely with her Latvian fellow politician's view of Gorbachev. She has, if possible, even less faith that Gorbachev will revert to being a reform politician.

"A few months ago Gorbachev could still balance between communists and the democratic movement. But recently the communists have become more like the old-style communists. The democrats have left the party and are now in opposition against their former party. Gorbachev has no power base other than the party."

Otto Lambsdorff, leader of Germany's liberal Free Democratic Party, is chairman of the liberals' Stockholm meeting. He voiced Western liberals' concern over developments in the Baltic region and stressed Germany's special role in this context.

"My own country has not only political but also moral obligations to the Baltic region. It was after all the pact between Hitler and Stalin which crushed the freedom of the Baltic countries."

Yesterday morning the Baltic politicians took part in a special contact meeting with the Liberal International at the initiative of the Swedish Liberal People's Party.

Today the liberals will also discuss a proposal that in the wake of the Gulf war a demand be made for a UN-controlled monitoring body to end the less acceptable aspects of the international arms trade.

Gorbunovs Evaluates Latvian Referendum Results

LD0403190291

[Editorial Report] Riga Domestic Service in Latvian at 0900 GMT on 4 March carries a 45-minute live relay of a news conference by Latvian Supreme Soviet Chairman Anatolijs Gorbunovs and Gunars Blums, chairman of the Central Electoral Commission.

Gorbunovs is reminded of his pre-referendum statement that more than one-half of Latvia's people would vote for independence, and is asked to comment on the actual results. Gorbunovs replies: "I don't think this is the worst outcome. If I had made a more favorable forecast, and we had had a worse result, then I would have been disappointed. But I am favorably impressed by the fact that there is not a single district, not a single region in Latvia, not a single city in which less than half the voters chose an independent and democratic Latvia."

Gorbunovs then answers a question from REUTER on the future work of parliament and citizenship legislation. An AP correspondent asks what kind of signal the referendum result sends to the Kremlin, especially with regard to the non-Latvian population. Gorbunovs expresses hope for a new concept on the Baltic issue from the Soviet side at the end of March or the beginning of April.

THE PHILADELPHIA INQUIRER asks why so many non-Latvians supported independence, and there is a question in Russian on why some did not participate—were they Russians? Gorbunovs points out that the majority of non-Latvians did vote; Blums provides percentages in Russian to support this.

Gorbunovs then answers questions on citizenship policy, possible response from Western governments to the referendum result, and whether he expects a change in the Soviet Goverment's attitude to the Baltic issue. The news conference ends at 0945 GMT.

Opposing Views Reported

LD0403204591 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1810 GMT 4 Mar 91

[By TASS correspondent Galina Kuchina]

[Text] Riga, 4 Mar (TASS)—Latvian legislative and opposition leaders have appraised in different ways the outcome of the poll held on 3 March on the future of this Baltic republic: as a stabilizing factor and as a road leading to a dead end.

Anatolijs Gorbunovs, chairman of the Latvian Supreme Soviet, expressed the hope that the inhabitants' opinion on the independence of the republic expressed on 3 March would be an additional argument for the Kremlin, and that the Kremlin would correct its policy regarding the Baltic region. "We are ready to start talks with Moscow on the de facto restoration of our statehood," he said, speaking at a news conference today.

Anatolijs Gorbunovs described as high the percentage of those who took part in the vote. As already reported, they comprised 87.5 percent of the total number of people on the electoral roll. To the question, "Are you in favor of a democratic Latvian republic as an independent state?" 73.6 percent of those who came to the polls replied in the affirmative. "These figures testify," Gorbunovs continued, "that the declaration of independence adopted by the legislature is supported by the majority of the people of Latvia."

In the view of the head of the legislature, the nonindigenous population cast its vote mainly for a democratic republic and therefore, Gorbunovs stressed, these are the processes in the development of society that the

Supreme Soviet should ensure. The head of the legislature believes that the poll will become a stabilizing factor in the life of Latvia.

In contrast to Anatolijs Gorbunovs, who is satisfied with the poll figures, Sergey Dimanis, head of the minority faction, said that "he does not see anything good in the results of the voting for either of the conflicting sides—the adherents or opponents of a Latvia outside the USSR."

"Of all the inhabitants on the electoral roll, 64.4 percent said 'yes'; that is, less than two-thirds," Dimanis commented. "In Riga the figure was 49.1 percent, and for all towns subordinate to the republic, except the capital, it was 48.9 percent."

According to him, the barricades in the people's minds divide the townspeople into two nearly equal halves. Since Latvians, comprising 52 percent, in their overwhelming majority gave a positive answer to the question, Dimanis claims that this position is shared by only 15 percent of the representatives of the non-indigenous population. On the basis of calculations he has made, the head of the opposition drew the conclusion: "In the towns a sharp radicalization of mood is under way, the proportion of non-indigenous inhabitants supporting the separation of Latvia is not so high, and unless the legislature changes its policy in moving toward independence, society will find itself in a dead end."

Referendum Results Analyzed

LD0403154991 Moscow World Service in English 1210 GMT 4 Mar 91

[Text] Estonia and Latvia have revealed preliminary returns of Sunday's referendum to determine the population's stand on the future of those republics. Details from Sergey Vorobyev:

About 85 percent of Estonia's population have taken part in the poll and at least 70 percent of them favored independence of the republic. Some 77 percent of Latvian citizens voted for democracy and independence of that other Baltic republic. As the chairman of the Latvian parliament Anatolijs Gorbunovs predicted on the eve of the poll, supporters of republican independence through secession from the Soviet Union would be in the majority. He also predicted most citizens of non-Latvian background, that is about 48 percent of Latvia's population, would reply in the affirmative to the question of whether they favored democracy and state independence for their home republic.

Both predictions came true as most people believed in good intentions of those who phrased the question. The poll, however, ignored the possibility for Latvia to remain a democratic and independent part of the Soviet Union. The Latvian and Estonian authorities lose no chance to emphasize the poll's outcome is not legally binding. The returns can only show public support of the Baltic leaders' strategy to help promote their (?course) abroad.

The governments of both republics invited many countries and international organizations to send observers. They could see the poll embraced only permanent residents of Latvia and Estonia, although ethnic Latvians and Estonians outside the two republics protested this. The Union of Baltic Servicemen qualified the residence qualification as unconstitutional since Soviet servicemen of Latvian and Estonian descent were refused the right to vote even if they were doing active duty on the territory of those republics.

The poll was staged to offer an alternative to the nationwide referendum scheduled for the 17th of this month to find out whether the Soviet citizens want to preserve the Soviet Union or not. The Baltic authorities deliberately ignored the question by the separate referendums.

The most Soviet citizens favor a renewed union and see it as the only way to ensure free development; guarantee security and economic, scientific, and cultural advancement of all ethnic groups within the national boundaries; to retain the country's high international prestige. Only a democratic nationwide referendum can reflect this stand while local referendums are unable to do so.

Republic, Union Referendums Examined

91UN0986A Moscow RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA in Russian 1 Mar 91 p 1

[Reply to reader's question by Vyacheslav Proskura, RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA correspondent in Latvia: "As If the Union Did Not Exist?..."]

[Text] Will there be a referendum in the Baltic republics? If so, how are the commissions in charge of its conduct formed? To what degree is the ethnic composition of the population reflected in them?

[Signed] V. Kapinosov, Kiev.

"On his return from Germany, I. Godmanis, chairman of the Latvian Republic Council of Ministers, said that in the course of this visit he met with the most influential politicians of that country and politically active representatives of Latvian emigration. A great deal of attention was paid to the Latvian referendum set for 3 March... 'Nobody is going to give us something for nothing,' I. Godmanis said. The Latvian premier and German Chancellor H. Kohl agreed on cooperation in the field of information—the creation of information centers on a reciprocal basis."

This report from the Latvian Government information service coincided in time with the news conference given by A. Klautsen, secretary of the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee and first secretary of Riga City Party Committee [Gorkom]. Arnold Petrovich clarified the position of the republic capital's communists in regard to the upcoming referendum. A gorkom plenum the day before decided to call on their supporters to participate in the plebiscite, but to strike out the word "yes."

The Latvian Communist Party Central Committee Bureau supported the "Riga option."

A reminder: The 3 March poll was set by the republic Supreme Soviet by a vote of the National Front "majority faction." The ballot, approved by the authorities, contains only one question: "Are you for a democratic, independent Latvian Republic?" (There will be two more words printed on the ballot—"yes" and "no." As they say, strike out the one that is not needed...)

At first glance, everything is simple. Go and vote in accordance with your beliefs. But, excuse me, who among us is against democracy and sovereignty? In general, and in regard to our own republic in particular? One would think that all are "for." However...

What do we do then with the Soviet Union? This state now includes Soviet Latvia. There is no such question on the ballot.

As to the referendum on the future of the USSR set for 17 March by decision of the Union parliament, the situation here is not yet clear. Judging by official pronouncements, the republic government does not intend to conduct such a poll. The authorities do say that they will not create any obstacles if some organization takes upon itself the organization of its conduct on a, so to say, volunteer basis. The local "politburo"—the Latvian Popular Front Duma—is more frank. The ruling bloc's leadership not only called on the population to boycott the upcoming referendum, but essentially prohibited all representatives of the power structure—state employees—from participating.

Speeches by Latvian Supreme Soviet Presidium members (all of them are Latvian Popular Front functionaries) underscore this: They see the poll set for 3 March as a consultative measure that will not have any political consequences. That is because the republic parliament has already adopted by two-thirds vote the "Declaration of Independence," which, as they say, establishes Latvia as an independent state.

Meanwhile the republic is now an arena for ideological battles. The times have changed, however. Now nonnatives who are loyal to the new authorities are promised lots of goodies—they are promised the same political and socioeconomic rights as the native population and the opportunity to become citizens in the future.

The opposition still has no access to state television and radio, with the exception of those occasions when "roundtables" are organized by the ruling bloc leaders themselves.

As has become known, a congress of the "Latvian Bloc of Leftist Forces" is being planned for the first days of March which will define its final position in regard to the all-Union referendum.

Communists Urged To Take Part in 17 Mar Vote

LD0403182691 Riga Domestic Service in Latvian 1000 GMT 4 Mar 91

[Text] We have stated our attitude to the future of Latvia. However, the government of the USSR is not renouncing its intention to hold a referendum on 17 March on the territory of Latvia too. Therefore several open ways are being sought to realize these ambitions. For example, the Salcgriva fish-canning works has received a telegram signed by the assistant director-general of the Latvian Fish Canneries Association, Comrade Nikitin. This message is a response to the (?rebukes) from the party committee of the USSR Ministry of Fisheries, urging all those working at the Salcagrivas works, and above all communists, to take part in the 17 March referendum. But in Valmiera, the CPSU rayon committee has decided to hold the 17 March referendum. At the moment it is predicted that there will be at least two polling stations in Valmiera, one at Zilaiskalns settlement.

Rubiks Urges Presidential Rule in Republic

LD2803204991 Moscow TASS in English 1113 GMT 28 Feb 91

[Text] Moscow February 28 TASS—"A civil war can be avoided in Latvia by declaring presidential rule in the republic," Politburo member and First Secretary of the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee Alfred Rubiks believes.

"This rule will have to be declared sooner or later," he told the weekly "GLASNOST". "The opposing sides are so powerful and their goals so different that it will be extremely difficult to set them at peace," he noted.

"A political struggle for power is going on in Latvia for the time being, and this struggle is open and ruthless," Rubiks said. "Our opponents are endeavouring, in pursuance of their own goals, to present it as an inter-ethnic confict. However, nothing can conceal the political nature of this confrontation."

Denouncing attacks on the All-Latvian Public Salvation Committee, Rubiks said it should not be presented as a bogey. It is a direct successor of the Committee for Protecting Civil Rights, the Constitutions of the USSR and the Latvian Soviet Socialist Republic, set up by the local public in May 1990. It was a legitimate reaction to the rejection by the Latvian supreme soviet, which adopted an independence declaration on May 4, of the presidential decree ruling it unconstitutional and subject to repeal.

The First Congress of the Committee for the Protection of Civil Rights, the Constitutions of the USSR and the Latvian Soviet Socialist Republic was held in November 1990, when public confrontation came to a head in the republic. It was attended by 2,227 delegates, elected practically from all the districts and towns of Latvia, as well as by people's deputies of every rank. That was when the committee was renamed into the All-Latvian Public Salvation Committee, because not only constitutional, but also other human rights were being violated in the republic.

Rubiks denied claims that this committee's activities and its very existence were unconstitutional.

"Firstly," he said, "in keeping with the Constitutions of the Latvian Soviet Socialist Republic and the USSR working people have the right to set up their own organisations. Secondly, not only the Public Salvation Committee, but other public and political organisations in Latvia remain unregistered, since corresponding laws are still lacking".

Rubiks said strikes could occur in Latvia if the present unpopular policy was continued. "in what other way can the authorities be made to start negotiations?" he inquires, noting that opponents of the Latvian Communist Party "are not very eager" to start such talks, preferring to play a double game.

U.S. Medical Aid Arrives in Riga

LD2802212891 Moscow TASS in English 1534 GMT 28 Feb 91

[Text] Riga February 28 TASS—A Boeing-707 landed in the Riga airport today in the morning. It brought 26 tonnes of valuable cargoes—medication and medical instruments worth two million dollars. This is a gift of the American people to peoples of the Baltic republics, the LETA news agency reports. Mikhail Gorbachev and George Bush concluded an agreement last December on rendering humanitarian assistance to the Soviet Union. The United States decided to render this assistance directly to Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia.

Representatives of the project Hope firm, which has been assigned to fulfil the mission, will see to it that the valuable cargoes reach the addressees without fail. In Latvia the cargoes will be delivered to the republican clinical hospital named after Paul Stradin, the republican children's clinical hospital and the Ogre central regional hospital.

On Friday representatives of the firm will go to Vilnius and Tallinn to escort the cargoes personally.

Witnesses to 20 Jan MVD Attack Sought

PM0403145191 Riga SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA in Russian 12 Feb 91 p 3

[Unattributed report: "In the Latvian Republic Prosecutor's Office"]

[Text] The Latvian Republic Prosecutor's Office and the USSR Prosecutor's Office have established a joint investigation group in connection with the 20 January 1991 attack on the Latvian Republic MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs] building. In line with the distribution of duties within the group, Latvian Republic Prosecutor's Office staffers are concerned with establishing and interrogating witnesses of what happened and officials with any knowledge of these events.

Even during the preliminary stage of the investigation over 260 citizens who witnessed the events under investigation have contacted the Latvian Republic Prosecutor's Office. But to clarify all the circumstances of that tragic night it is necessary to have the fullest possible picture of what happened.

In this connection the Latvian Republic Prosecutor's Office appeals to all citizens who were in the area bounded by K. Valdemars, Elizabetes, and Brivibas Streets and Bastey Boulevard between 2045 on 20 January and 0330 on 21 January and who have not been questioned by Prosecutor's Office officials to telephone 21-36-74. We request all citizens who were in this area to call this number even if they think they have nothing to tell about the events under investigation.

In particular the investigation asks passengers on the No. 37 bus which left the "Planetarium" terminus at around 2120 to make contact.

We also request individuals who saw OMON [special purpose militia unit] vehicles and equipment heading toward the MVD building before the shooting started and returning to base after the building was liberated, and also citizens who know anything about the events of the night of 20 January, even if they were not in the said area that night, to call the above number.

The investigation thanks all those who have already contacted the Latvian Republic Prosecutor's Office for their help.

Investigation Into Riga Bombings Detailed

PM0503094391 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 1 Mar 91 Union Edition p 4

[Correspondent I. Litvinova report: "Riga: Prosecutors Pursue Investigation"]

[Text] Riga—Building conjecture and elaborating versions of the January events have become a most widespread phenomenon in Riga. I asked law-enforcement agency workers involved in the criminal cases which have been instituted to talk about the explosions and shooting and their reflection in the press.

What does Latvian Republic Prosecutor General Janis Skrastins know about the explosions that stunned Riga in December-January?

"KGB and Ministry of Internal Affairs [MVD] investigators and prosecutors are engaged on the case," the prosecutor general said. "We agreed that the Latvian Republic Prosecutor's Office would coordinate actions."

"But what information can be reported already?"

"There is some information. Some explosions, for example, by the state security building were, I would say, caused by children's fireworks. It is necessary to talk separately about the explosions at the Lenin Monument, the Communist Party's sociopolitical center, the premises of the military prosecutor, at the railroad hospital, and in the garden of the railcar plant. They could have been carried out by the same group. At least, in all these incidents traces of an identical explosive were discovered. This was confirmed by tests carried out by USSR MVD experts who came to Riga. The same explosive device was employed. Industrially produced explosive was used. We also know one person connected with the explosions. But as he is merely one link in the chain, I cannot say any more for fear of compromising the investigation."

Valeriy Kostarev, leader of the investigation group and senior investigator in charge of particularly important cases in the USSR Prosecutor General's office:

"The group is made up of 20 people—USSR Prosecutor's Office officials, officials of the Latvian Republic and the Latvian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic], the military prosecutor's office, the KGB, and the MVD. The criminal case is too fresh to give any information about the development of events. But I can say that acquaintance with the circumstances of the case indicates that everything differs radically from the way in which it is being presented in the mass media. Those articles have nothing in common with the actual investigation, they are pure propaganda items which moreover abound in hasty and completely unfounded conclusions.

"A Leningrad City Soviet deputy who came to Riga to study the situation doubts that members of the OMON [Special-Purpose Militia Unit] were provoked. But we are still checking this. The same deputy argues: 'The seizure of the MVD building, even given that it was a reaction to some action against relatives of theirs, can only be described as an act of banditry.' I consider such judgments and assessments to be, to put it mildly, premature from the legal standpoint. As far as the 'relatives' or, more precisely, the outrage committed against the wife of a member of the OMON, is concerned, that did take place. A criminal case has been instituted and an investigation is under way. The investigation has to establish whether this was connected with subsequent events.

"We marvel at what we read: It turns out that no investigation at all is needed. Judging by the mass media, everything is clear.

"Unfortunately, the same applies to articles in the republic press. Yet we are, after all, apparently trying to build a rule-of-law state in which the generally recognized norms of democracy and rights, including the presumption of innocence, are mandatory.

"We have complex, demanding work ahead. We hope to be able to reconstitute the picture of events and bring the culprits to book. We are not refusing to cooperate with the press: Glasnost will clarify everything in this case."

Irina Yevstropova, investigator in charge of particularly important cases in the Latvian SSR Prosecutor's Office:

"I am investigating the outrage committed against citizen L., wife of a platoon commander in the special-purpose militia unit. A statement was made to the prosecutor's office 21 January. The crime—rape by two men—was committed 20 January between 1800-2000. All the urgent investigatory actions were carried out 21 January. Expert examination confirmed the fact of the outrage and the investigation continues. Georg Beskhlebnikov, chairman of the Latvian Republic voluntary detachment of 'guardians of order,' acknowledged in an interview on Latvian television and in the newspaper BALTIYSKOYE VREMYA that citizen L. had been detained by three 'guardians of order.' He pointed out that the woman was detained in the belief that she was the investigator in charge of the case of five 'guardians of order' detained by members of the OMON that day. He denied the charge of rape.

"On what grounds did Beskhlebnikov's 'guardians of order' wish to obtain information from an investigator? That constitutes a breach of the law for any form of authority. The investigation which I am conducting is hampered by the fact that Beskhlebnikov refuses to testify or respond to my summons and will not communicate the names of the three 'guardians of order' who detained the woman. Nevertheless I consider that we will succeed in indicting the culprits.

"In respect of the five 'guardians' detained by the OMON, I have opened proceedings under Article 218, Sections 1 and 3, of the Latvian SSR Criminal Code on suspicion of obtaining, possessing, and carrying edged weapons and munitions. An itemized charge against each of the suspects was preferred in the presence of their lawyers, as the law demands.

"By a ruling of 25 January lawyer Kozlovskiy was removed from the case for violation of the rules of defense because he had begun circulating secrets of the investigation in the mass media. Mass picketing of the prosecutor's office began at his urging. Instead of looking after the defense of his clients, the lawyer engaged in politics. This case is after all a criminal one first and foremost. The relatives found new lawyers. Because of the abnormal situation surrounding the prosecutor's office building and interference in the investigation by the republic mass media I was forced to leave Latvia along with the detainees. This is allowed by the law. That was the only way I could conduct a proper investigation. The five suspects have now been released on their own recognizance. Expert examination has not confirmed the occurrence of assault during arrest or at the OMON base."

And now some new facts, dating from February. Boris Bondarenko, chief of the Baltic Transport Prosecutor's Office Investigation Department:

"On 25 February, at around 1530 hours, we received a report from switchboard No. 2 that an unknown person had telephoned the militia and warned that an explosive device had been placed in the checkroom at the central railroad station. Someone made a call to the OMON base at approximately the same time and even specified the section of the checkroom where the explosive device plus weapons and munitions were located. Such calls are not, alas, uncommon and passengers are reluctant even to leave the station premises: We know, they say, that they are hoaxes. However, this time it proved to be no hoax. Thanks to members of the OMON, everything was done with the utmost efficiency. A detonator was found in a package disguised as a parcel of fruit in locker 363. There were also 10 pistols with spare clips and boxes of cartridges. The package also contained a cutting from the newpaper ZEME with the names of the six people who died during the dramatic January events in Riga written on it. Opposite four of them were the names of Rubiks, first secretary of the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee; Kuzmin, district commander; Mlynnik, commander of the OMON detachment; and Deputy Alksnis. There were question marks alongside two names. That is all I can tell you to date. A criminal case has been opened and an investigation is under way."

RSFSR

Yeltsin Chairs Union Treaty Commission Meeting

LD0503094091 Moscow TASS in English 0829 GMT 5 Mar 91

[By TASS correspondent Lev Aksenov]

[Text] Moscow March 5 TASS—A commission of Russian lawmakers, formed by the second emergency Congress of Russian People's Deputies in December 1990, began discussing the new draft treaty of the Union today.

The commission meetings are chaired by Russian President Boris Yeltsin.

Representatives of several republics worked on the draft. They agreed on most issues and came up with alternative versions of several articles.

Pro-Yeltsin Rally Planned for 10 Mar

LD0403144491 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1300 GMT 4 Mar 91

[Text] Responding to numerous questions from listeners, I report that according to Vera Kriger, a member of the Coordinating Council of the Movement of Democratic Russia, rallies in support of Boris Yeltsin will be held on 10 March in all the towns and regions of Russia, at 1200 local time. In Moscow, rallies will be held at 1100 [0800 GMT] in Insurrection Square and in October Square. A rally will, as usual, also be held in Manezhnaya Square.

Incidentally, listeners are also very interested in the state of Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsins health. I can report that today, following his illness, he resumed the execution of his duties. He participated in the work of the parliamentary commission on the Union treaty.

Rally Said Banned in Izhevsk

LD0503142291 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1350 GMT 5 Mar 91

[Text] It is intended to hold rallies in support of the activity of the Russian Supreme Soviet and its leader Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin in many RSFSR towns next Sunday.

We have just had a phone call from Izhevsk from listener Strelkova, saying that the town authorities have forbidden the holding of a rally in Izhevsk on 10 March. We have not had similar reports from other towns, but Izhevsk cannot be an exception. So all those preparing to come out in support of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet and Boris Yeltsin and who are not being allowed to do so, please tell us at Radio Rossii.

Moscow To Hold Poll on Mayoral Election 17 Mar

LD0403223591 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 2119 GMT 4 Mar 91

[From the "Television News Service" program]

[Text] The INTERFAX news agency has reported: The Presidium of the Moscow City Soviet has adopted a decision to hold a city opinion poll on 17 March 1991, alongside the Union and republican referendums. Muscovites will have to answer "yes" or "no" to the question: "Do you consider it necessary to hold a direct election of the mayor of Moscow to the city's residents?"

Yeltsin's Tactics Against Gorbachev Analyzed

PM0503111991 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 Mar 91 Second Edition pp 3-4

[Article by Candidate of Philosophical Sciences V. Mitrokhin: "'Eternal Opponent?' Details of B. Yeltsin's Political Portrait"]

[Text] It is best to remain silent about the strong of this world, the well-known French writer J. LaBruyere warned: to speak well of them almost always means to flatter; to speak ill of them is dangerous while they still live and unseemly when they are dead. Nevertheless they have to be talked about. During their lifetime and without flattery.

Against the backdrop of the total crisis of society Boris Yeltsin holds a special place in the political portrait gallery. First, he is the main political figure in combat with the USSR president. Second, he is the acknowledged leader of a movement with a broad and extremely contradictory "liberal revolutionary" orientation. Third and equally important, he is one of the few politicians in the USSR who has mastered the tough rules of political confrontation with some degree of success. Whereas most of the population are concerned about this confrontation, there are certain social forces hoping to obtain political dividends of one kind or another. They are not being idle. Recently some mass media have been intensively bombarding public opinion with the idea that it is Mikhail Gorbachev who is to blame for everything.

V. Tretyakov's article "'The Imposter' and Perestroyka, or Why Mikhail Sergeyevich Picked a Quarrel With Boris Nikolayevich," published in NAZAVISIMAYA GAZETA, which Tretyakov himself edits, is typical in this respect. The author makes no secret of his sympathies for B.N. Yeltsin.

"I will state honestly and immediately," he writes, "that in the present situation I am more attracted to the political figure of Yeltsin than to Gorbachev. Of course there is an element of political gamesmanship in both of their behavior. But whereas Gorbachev, who from being the people's favorite has become a reclusive politician almost isolated from people, is concerned not so much with winning back their (the people's) sympathies as with robbing Yeltsin of them, Yeltsin, by contrast, is seeking more an alliance of his own with people than Gorbachev's further isolation."

Deliberate exaggeration is a well-known journalistic device, and the purposes for which it is used are also well known. As far as Gorbachev is concerned, it is hardly appropriate to describe him as a reclusive politician since, as not only V. Tretyakov is very well aware, when reclusiveness emerges politics disappears. The picture that the author conjures up of what B. Yeltsin is seeking is also manifestly unviable. What he is seeking is extremely obvious and its thrust is extremely clear—savage confrontation.

In his article V. Tretyakov puts into practice what he said "honestly and immediately" at the beginning, attempting to prove that Mikhail Sergeyevich is continuing a damaging dispute with Boris Nikolayevich rather than vice versa. The author of the article sees the following as the way out of the situation:

"It seems to me," he writes, "that a personal alliance between them is impossible. But a 'peace treaty' must be signed between them. On what terms? It goes without saying that Yeltsin will not allow Russia to capitulate in the face of the center. Gorbachev must make a big sacrifice on the center's behalf. But this is the only chance for the center to remain the center."

This was written at the end of January. But processes in our society develop so fast that Boris Yeltsin—evidently fearful of missing a chance and seeking to restore the shaken authority of the head of the Russian legislature in the wake of the destructive "war of laws" and "war of sovereignties" and his indifferent attitude to the violations of the rights and freedoms of the Russian-speaking population in the Baltic republics, Moldova, and other republics (which provoked a sensitive reaction from the barometer of public opinion)—decided to crank his confrontation with Gorbachev up a notch, which was initiated by his 19 February statement on television. This caused adjustments to be made to the political portrait drawn by V. Tretyakov. It transpires that is is no longer "sacrifices" that are needed. The demand was simply for the center to be cut down to size. Simple and politically inexpensive.

We will ponder the point of this step by Boris Yeltsin in greater detail a little later. But it is worth noting now that his performance in the conflict between the leaders has put all the pieces in their place. And the main point has become clear: The confrontation is primarily caused by two characters, two different styles of political thought and action. It is my profound conviction that the initiator of this confrontation is Yeltsin, whose tactic of continually forcing the pace is mainly determined by a permanent dissatisfaction with his own sociopolitical status, which, as he sees it, does not match his personal potential. This is the reason for his intoxication with struggle, his intoxication with himself, his intoxication with playing the role of the eternal extremely principled commanding officer loved by his "political foot soldiers" and the people.

To avoid using unsubstantiated statements, let us make use of what I would regard as two pretty reliable sources: B. Yeltsin's book "Confessions on a Given Theme" and the stenographic record of the 26th CPSU Congress. There was not much of an interval between these two events.

First on the subject of extreme commitment to principle. We read in B. Yeltsin's book:

"The 26th party congress. I prepared earnestly and wanted, of course, to strike a blow against the mire of stagnation that had developed in the country. Although the speech turned out to be militant and stood out against the background of the paeans to Brezhnev, I lacked, as I said at the 27th congress, both the experience and, most importantly, the political courage to resolutely take up arms against our rotten party-bureaucratic system. Furthermore I still didn't know the members of the Central Committee well enough to seriously influence things, although I could see that the center was not functioning."

Now let us open Volume 1 of the stenographic record (pages 230-235) and read the genuine article, so to speak. The terms in which the author talked about the "nonfunctioning center" and the "rotten party-bureaucratic system":

"B.N. Yeltsin: Comrades! The past five years have been another major milestone in the heroic annals of the Land of the Soviets! As the latest party congress demonstrates, the country today consists of the powerful productive forces that our society possesses, the real benefits that developed socialism provides for Soviet people, the peace and tranquillity that protects them. And all this is the result of the wise collective reason, titanic labor, unbending will, and unsurpassed organizational talent of the Communist Party and its combat headquarters—the Central Committee and the Politburo headed by Comrade Leonid Ilich Brezhnev. (Applause)...

"Each one of us has been constantly aware of the difficulty and intensiveness of the work of the Central Committee, its Politburo, and Comrade Brezhnev... The people of Sverdlovsk reacted with great gratitude to the kind words spoken by...Leonid Ilich Brezhnev in the keynote report and will respond with action to such a high assessment... All this is vivid proof of the CPSU Central Committee's exceptional farsightedness and perspicacity... We fully approve the measures adopted by the CPSU Central Committee... And the communists and all working people of Sverdlovsk Oblast assure...Leonid Ilich Brezhnev that they will fight for this awe-inspiring and beautiful future with all revolutionary passion and unwavering devotion to the Communist Party's cause. (Prolonged applause)."

This speech, like many others, also contained both carefully modulated criticism and proposals, but the academic political linguists who analyze the vocabulary of the party functionaries of those years conclude that, strange as it may seem, B. Yeltsin even outperformed such songbirds of stagnation as G.A. Aliyev, V.V. Grishin, S.F. Medunov, and Sh.R. Rashidov in terms of numbers of high-flown expressions and words to describe the stagnation era ("major milestone," "heroic annals," "powerful productive forces," "wise leadership," "titanic labor," "unbending will," "unsurpassed organizational talent," "most important contribution to theory," "magnificent prospects," "exceptional farsightedness and perspicacity," and so on and so forth).

So where are the confessions here? Where are the recapitulations on a given theme? Surely Boris Nikolayevich in 1990 had not forgotten how "militant" his speech to the 26th CPSU Congress was and how it stood out "against the backdrop of paeans". I don't think so. It's something different—hope that other people are forgetful.

"...I found a foreman's work pretty easy..." "My work as a combine chief worked out alright..." "A period of hectic work began (he means as first secretary of the Sverdlovsk CPSU Obkom [oblast committee]—author's note). And as had always been the case in my life, I did not spare myself first and foremost. The others gradually got drawn in... I did not feel some kind of holy terror when I crossed the threshold and started work in the CPSU Central Committee building... The sector needed to be boosted. I had a good knowledge of construction matters..." "The discussion went around the table and was relatively brief (he is referring to the Politburo discussion of the draft report on the 70th anniversary of October—author's note). On the whole the assessments were positive, with a few superficial criticisms. But when it came to my turn I voiced, pretty persistently, around 20 criticisms, each them very serious..."

Or take this very curious revelation:

"Later I reflected frequently on why Gorbachev came around to my candidacy. He evidently took into account my experience of nearly 10 years in the leadership of one of the country's biggest party organizations and the time I spent in industry... Moreover, he knew my character and was confident that I would be able to sweep away the old encumbrances and fight the mafia: Having a firm character and courage, I would be able to make radical cadre changes—all this was guessed at beforehand... The pattern of work (meaning at the Moscow CPSU Gorkom [city committee]—author's note) pushed even a tough guy like me to the limit..."

In a statement addressed to M. Gorbachev he writes:

"I realized it would be incredibly difficult, that on top of my existing experience much more would be needed, including time spent at work. None of this worried me. I sensed your support, and surprised even myself with the confidence with which I embarked on work (meaning at the Moscow CPSU Gorkom—author's note). I began to work with the new bureau unstintingly, on a principled collegial basis, and in a comradely manner..."

So wherever Yeltsin is, in his own assessment, there you will find energetic work and success. Gorbachev looks rather different seen through Boris Nikolayevich's eyes:

"...At the sessions now (meaning Politburo sessions—author's note) we used to sit for a long time, usually listening to monologues from the chairman... The main trouble with Gorbachev is that he lacked and still lacks... theoretically and strategically well considered moves... The main trouble with Gorbachev is a fear of taking resolute and highly necessary steps... Power is getting a hold on him, he is losing his sense of reality... he does not perceive people's reactions..."

There are many more opinions of the kind. Not a president, but a whole heap of errors. Throughout the book B. Yeltsin tries to push the idea that he is superior to Gorbachev:

"Concrete actions are needed, new steps forward are needed. But Gorbachev does not want to take these steps... I have clearly gone further in my speeches at meetings with Muscovites..." "I am not so fond of rallies. Particularly rallies of many thousands of people...at Luzhniki... But nonetheless the rally is probably one of the most powerful and difficult forms of education...

"I am sorry that Gorbachev does not take part in rallies. It would be extremely useful for him. For him...the experience of Luzhniki rallies would be a very valuable lesson..."

Such remarks hardly require a commentary. The desire to turn the country into a Luzhniki rally is not producing social results as yet. Incidentally, these rally universities have not helped Boris Nikolayevich himself, either. As a rule he does not "go to the masses" without notes and the constant custodianship of advisers. Or if he does, no one ventures afterward to publish transcripts of his speeches—they contain so much "oratorical skill" and "profound theoretical thought."

And in this chain of events B. Yeltsin's 19 February speech is no chance phenomenon. Yet again he repented his mistake in putting "excessive trust in the president" and...not only charged him with all our troubles, but even blamed the center for his own mistakes. This "new insight" of Boris Nikolayevich's is only the next logical, well-thought-out move arising from the technique of political struggle he has adopted.

B. Yeltsin has done something similar before, more than once: in October 1987, at the 19th All-Union Party Conference, and before the elections of USSR people's deputies. It is a kind of political pick-me-up that is used when a substantial shortfall in constructive work becomes apparent, leading to a fall in the leader's popularity. The object is to give a sharp boost to the value of his own shares and to show his opponents in an unflattering light. The most favorable background for such an action is an unstable sociopolitical atmosphere in society.

The game begins with a loud political "bang," superficially unexpected and approaching a political scandal. Because this revives in people's minds the image of a fighter, a champion, the image of someone who is oppressed... Next, inevitably, comes a move from his opponent. This move must be disastrous, like Ye. Ligachev's speech at the 19th All-Union Party Conference or Tikhomirov's article in MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA before B. Yeltsin's election as a USSR people's deputy. Then the propaganda machine comes into action.

Today the scenario could repeat itself. But the statement by a section of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet leadership was patently unexpected, because it does not call for Boris Nikolayevich's resignation or for political reprisals. Moreover, experienced politicians and political scientists realize that this does not yet constitute a move.

The "services" of the Coordinating Council of the Marxist Platform in the CPSU, which appealed to citizens of the republic to demand that Russia's people's deputies vote out the chairman of the Supreme Soviet, also can hardly be taken seriously.

There is not yet an injured party, this image has not yet been created, but the champions are already at work. Once again it is "down with the president," once again it is "down with the Kremlin mafia," once again the extreme "independent" press is at work. The emphasis is shifting away from the real situation, the mass consciousness is again being subjected to the canard about the intrigues of the apparatus, conservative forces, and the KGB, about the onset of dictatorship...

"I dissociate myself from the president's position and policy," B. Yeltsin stated 19 February. "I call for his immediate resignation. For the transfer of power to a collective body—the Federation Council of the republics."

Naturally, it is not hard to guess who will play the lead on that council. What I do not know is who it was who blundered—the man who read it, or the people who wrote it—but this time the "bang" went beyond the bounds of civilized politics. You do not have to be an academician and a member of Boris Nikolayevich's consultative council to realize that this political improvisation by the head of the RSFSR's organ of legislative power and the leader of "liberal revolutionary" forces can only be realized through a political coup.

Because, if the civilized, constitutional path is followed, the president's resignation does not lead to the resignation or disbandment of the USSR Supreme Soviet and Congress of People's Deputies and the transfer of power to the Federation Council of the republics, which does not have the legal basis to take power. Nonetheless, the bets are placed, the game goes on...

"...I had dealings with the general secretary, but only by telephone," he writes in his "Confessions on a Given Theme," "and frankly, I admit I was surprised that he did not want to meet with me and talk. First, after all, relations between us were normal, and second, Gorbachev knew very well that like me, he had moved to the Central Committee from the post of kraykom [kray party committee] first secretary. That was in a kray with a considerably lower economic potential than Sverdlovsk Oblast, but he had arrived as Central Committee secretary... Sverdlovsk Oblast ranks third in the country in terms of production, and the party obkom first secretary, with unique experience and knowledge, could have been used more effectively. And indeed, it was traditionally so: Party obkom first secretary Kirilenko became a Central Committee secretary, Ryabov became a Central Committee secretary, yet they make me a department chief."

This, in my view, provides one answer to the question why M. Gorbachev became, to use an expression taken from these "Confessions," the "eternal opponent" of B. Yeltsin.

I do not know whether Boris Nikolayevich gave any thought to the meaning of the word "eternal," but the expression "eternal opponent" is highly significant, because eternity is not only the past and present, but also the future, although, in this case, it is a future that is very limited in time and in political space. Because the game is not eternal.

Presidium Says Referendum Obstacles Unlawful

LD0503111191 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1000 GMT 5 Mar 91

[Text] On 4 March, a regular session of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Supreme Soviet Presidium was held in the RSFSR House of

Soviets. The Presidium press service reports that RSFSR bills on foreign investment and on rehabilitating repressed peoples were examined. It was decided to submit them for examination by a session of the Russian Supreme Soviet. The following were adopted: a decree on state duty for registering enterprises in the RSFSR, and a resolution on an interregional association of krays, oblasts, and autonomous formations in Siberia, the Siberian Agreement. In addition, the session examined progress in fulfilling the republican Supreme Soviet's resolution on measures for ensuring the holding of the USSR referendum and the RSFSR referendum on 17 March. Regarding the fact that individual local soviets of people's deputies were attempting to thwart the holding of the Russian Federation's referendum, the Supreme Soviet Presidium declared decisions blocking the holding of the republic's referendum unconstitutional and not liable to execution. A decision of the Smolensk Oblast Soviet of People's Deputies not to hold the RSFSR referendum was also rescinded as being at variance with articles of the Russian Constitution. It was stipulated that in republics forming part of the Russian Federation, autonomous oblasts, okrugs, krays, and oblasts where central, republican, and constituency commissions are not conducting work on preparing the republican referendum, local soviets of people's deputies are entitled to resolve this issue independently on their territory. It was decided to introduce an institution of observers of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Presidium to observe the holding of the referendums of the USSR and of the RSFSR on 17 March on the territory of the Russian Federation and to render organizational and methodological assistance to the commissions. The session also examined other matters concerning the state life of Russia.

Democratic Russia Leader Urges Union 'No' Vote

LD0303063191 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 2050 GMT 2 Mar 91

[Report by special correspondent Nikolay Arsenyev]

[Excerpts] The time remaining until the 17 March referendum is getting shorter and shorter. Of course, our listeners are interested in every detail. [passage omitted]

The various political parties and movements are making up their minds on the forthcoming referendum. Here is what Yuriy Afanasyev, the leader and a member of the coordinating council of the Democratic Russia movement—one of the most influential political trends—has to say:

[Begin Afanasyev recording] We have already had a number of meetings of the coordinating council of the Democratic Russia movement in which we have discussed the question of the USSR Supreme Soviet for this referendum. The opinion of the Democratic Russia movement on this matter is unanimous: We will call for voters to say no to this question, and seek to ensure that they do so. That is, we want them to say no to the question asked by the USSR Supreme Soviet. On the other hand, there is no doubt about the question of Yeltsin's presidency. We will be calling on people to respond to that question in the affirmative, with a yes vote. [end recording]

Deputy Fears 'Yes' Vote on Union Referendum

91UN0969A Moscow RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA in Russian 27 Feb 91 p 1

[Unattributed article under the general heading "Let's Not Tear Apart the Country": "Live Broadcast"]

[Text]

Voice of America

USSR People's Deputy Arkadiy Murachev, cochairman of Democratic Russia:

"...We feel great danger that the majority of people may say 'yes' (at the referendum.—ed.) to Gorbachev in Russia, and, of course, it concerns us very much, because we understand that a positive result of this referendum means a lot for Gorbachev. It will give him a free hand in practically all nuances of this issue. Of course, we will encounter the situation where Gorbachev will claim that the people, again, made a socialist choice, because there is the word 'socialist' in the referendum question, and that the people voted for Soviet power in its present form because there is also the word 'Soviet' in it."

Democratic Russia Movement Assails Gorbachev

LD0203002591 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 2050 GMT 1 Mar 91

[Vladimir Baburin commentary]

[Text] A presentation by the Democratic Russia movement took place today in the Central House of Journalists in Suvorovskiy Boulevard, Moscow. USSR People's Deputies Ilya Zaslavskiy, Telman Gdlyan, and Arkadiy Murashev and Russian People's Deputies (Anatoliy Shalov) and Father Gleb Yakunin took part in the presentation. Ilya Zaslavskiy declared: Democratic Russia is not a political party with a single program, but an association, a conglomerate of political parties which may even have serious differences in their programs but which have a single ultimate aim: the triumph of a democratic society in the Soviet Union.

Zaslavskiy described the presentation as anti-Communist and anti-Gorbachev. Here I would like to note that one should not mix the notions of anti-Communist and anti-Soviet. Anti-Communist only refers to a non-acceptance of the means and methods of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union which during the more than 70 years that it has been in power has led the country into a deadlock. But this does not mean anti-Soviet. On the contrary, according to the people's deputies who took part in the presentation, it is the Communists who are now occupying an anti-Soviet position because they have organized a campaign to discredit a body legally elected in a nationwide election—the Supreme Soviet of Russia—and to persecute its leader Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin.

Inevitably, the forthcoming 17 March referendum became a central issue at the presentation. Rather, two referendums—the all-Union one and the Russian one. Democratic Russia has suggested unequivocally that the question of the all-Union referendum on the preservation of the USSR should be answered in the negative. This does not mean that Democratic Russia is against the USSR. By calling for a negative answer, Democratic Russia is saying no to the present totalitarian Union. It suggests that no confidence should be placed to Gorbachev and his team for any unpredictable actions he might take on behalf of the people, hiding behind the results of the referendum. As to the question on the introduction of a presidential post in Russia, Democratic Russia is calling on the population of the Russian Federation to answer it in the affirmative.

Father Gleb Yakunin, Russian people's deputy, tersely formulated the position of democratic Russia at the referendum: Gorbachev—no, Yeltsin—yes. He means that if the peoples of Russia vote for the introduction of the post of president, there will be no serious competitors for Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin in the contest for this position.

North Ossetia Deputies Reject RSFSR Referendum

LD0203212591 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 2 Mar 91

[Text] The extraordinary session of the North Ossetia Supreme Soviet took place in Vladikavkaz today. By a majority of votes, the deputies adopted a decision which says that there is no possibility of holding the Russian Federation referendum on the territory of North Ossetia on 17 March. In their opinion, carrying out the two referendums simultaneously will complicate the social and political situation and will make it more difficult for the people to express their will at the all-Union referendum. The North Ossetia Supreme Soviet supports the preservation of the USSR on the renewed basis and appeals to the citizens of the republic to support this position on 17 March. This information was received through the TASS channels.

Soviet Press Divided on Referendum

LD0403233591 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1200 GMT 4 Mar 91

[Excerpts] As usual at this hour Radio Rossii presents a press review. But, since, as you know very few papers are published here on Mondays, I suggest that we turn to the press for the last few days and see what our publications of different orientations are writing on the referendum, which is due in less than two weeks. [passage omitted]

The weekly MEGAPOLIS EKSPRESS carries the opinion of Boris Grushin, a sociologist and doctor of philosophy. To take part in the referendum of 17 March, he thinks, means to support our present Union authorities who are incapable of anything, and thus to condemn the country to many years of pauper existence and teetering on the brink of civil war. Today, in their desire to preserve the status quo, common sense has clearly deserted Gorbachev and the other organizers of the referendum. They are trying to stop the processes which are already, in principle, impossible to stop, Boris Grushin continues. Indeed, supposing the referendum says yes. Will this change the position of the peoples in the Baltics? Say, in Lithuania, where the overwhelming majority of the population has just spoken in favor of the status of an independent sovereign republic? Or, say, the government of Georgia, which, however you regard it, has been elected in an absolutely legal way and thus expresses the interests of its people. Of course not. They would never agree to obey voluntarily a simply majority of Russian population of the country. Then society will be confronted with countless fresh misfortunes, including more armed conflicts and clashes, stained with people's blood. There will be more failures in the economy and in the everyday life of the peoples in all republics, including Russia. End of quotation.

According to Boris Grushin, the only way out is to boycott the referendum, and to do it in an active way, that is, to take the voting-papers and then put them all together to find out what proportion of the population has formulated its attitude to the plebiscite in this fashion. [passage omitted]

The national-patriotic front Pamyat according to its leader Dmitriy Vasilyev, will also participate in the referendum on 17 March. The members of Pamyat will vote in favor. This has been reported by the weekly KURANTY, with a reference to the POSTFAKTUM news agency. [passage omitted]

Let us now turn to the Russian referendum. ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA points out that Smolensk Oblast Soviet has decided not to hold the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic referendum on the question of the republic's presidency on the oblast territory. In this connection the paper quotes Shakhray, People's Deputy of Russia, and I quote: What a pathological fear of your people you must have to deny them the right to voice their opinion on the people's power and its representatives. [passage omitted]

Legislature Debates Deputy Recall Law

PM0403163191 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 1 Mar 91 Second Edition p 4

[Report by Ye. Sorokin: "Illusions for Voters"]

[Text] Obviously, it is a coincidence, but the fact remains that the PRAVDA editorial office has recently received a stream of phone calls on one and the same theme. Readers are asking: When will the Russian law on the procedure for recalling a Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] people's deputy appear? The political demarcation in the Russian legislature and the clearly defined "identity" of this or that deputy in some cases have made the voters doubt the correctness of the choice they made a year ago at the polling station. Now, many of them, having found out how "democratic" their elected representatives actually are would be delighted to rectify their mistake, but, alas, the mechanism for recalling deputies does not as yet exist in Russia.

Yesterday the draft law was actually submitted for its first reading. It envisages a pretty rigorous procedure for recalling a Russian deputy. For instance, it is necessary to collect the signatures of 10 percent of the voters in the particular district and pay a deposit (an as yet undetermined sum), and 50 percent of the voters plus one would have to vote for recall.

The deputies were divided. Some reckon that, by analogy with Western countries, the law is not needed at all. Others, on the other hand, consider it too rigid. A.R. Khasbulatov even noted that the norms set down in the draft only give voters the illusion that a deputy can be recalled. The debate was heated, and sometimes not entirely proper. During the vote it transpired that the requisite majority was lacking in the Soviet of Nationalities for the draft law to be adopted on first reading. It was decided to set up a consultative commission drawn from the two chambers in order to obtain a repeat vote today. But the final decision on the draft will be taken by the next congress.

Some cadre matters were also decided during the morning sitting. S. Stepashin was elected chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Security Committee. V. Stepankov was appointed RSFSR general prosecutor. Before being elected a people's deputy he had been Khabarovsk Kray prosecutor and until yesterday he had been acting RSFSR general prosecutor.

It was an extremely full agenda yesterday, but, to the chairman's credit, it was fully dealt with. The deputies adopted a law on the operation on RSFSR territory of the 31 October 1990 USSR Law "On enhancing the liability for speculation, illegal trading activities, and abuses in trade" and thus brought the republic's legislation in this sphere into line with Union legislation. They adopted a resolution "On release from an occupational therapy clinic."

There was a heated debate on the draft law on amendments and additions to the RSFSR Criminal and Civil Codes and some other RSFSR legislative acts connected with the activities of the media. The draft law was adopted on its first reading.

A draft law on refugees and forced resettlement was rejected on its first reading and was sent for further work to be done on it.

As is known, on 5 February the USSR general prosecutor submitted a representation to the RSFSR Supreme Soviet on the matter of obtaining agreement to institute criminal proceedings against RSFSR People's Deputy A. Tarasov in respect of elements of the crime envisaged by part 2 of article 1 of the USSR Law "On the protection of the honor and dignity of the USSR president." The representation was distributed to deputies and they were supposed to have discussed it at the end of the day. But the discussion did not take place, because deputy A. Tarasov was not there. However, the action that took place in connection with it was like a rehearsed play, in which Deputies L. Gurevich, S. Nosovets, S. Yushenkov, and a number of others were prominent. The whole "parliamentary spectacle" was accompanied by attacks on the president and the Law on the protection of his honor and dignity, and by slow handclaps, sniggering, and heckling.

The session will continue today.

Agenda for Extraordinary Congress Noted

PM0403122691 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 4 Mar 91 Second Edition p 2

[Unattributed report: "On the Convening of an Extraordinary Congress of RSFSR, Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic, People's Deputies"]

[Text] The RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet has resolved to convene the Third Extraordinary Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies on 28 March 1991 in Moscow City, and proposed that the following items be included on the agenda for the congress:

On the political and socioeconomic situation in the RSFSR and measures to emerge from the crisis.
On the national-state structure of the RSFSR (on the Federal treaty).
On the Union treaty.

Deputy Says Legislature in 'Virtual Paralysis'

LD0403152491 Moscow TASS in English 1505 GMT 4 Mar 91

[By TASS legislative correspondents]

[Text] Moscow March 4 TASS—The Russian parliament is in a state of virtual paralysis, believes Victor Stepanov, a Russian people's deputy and member of the Russian Communist Party Politburo. Many members of parliament are highly critical of the activity of parliament's leaders. An extraordinary congress of the Russian Federation's people's deputies will open in Moscow on March 28.

Stepanov, a leader of the "Communists of Russia" group of deputies, believes that the situation in the parliament is a result of a complex political situation in the country and in the Russian federation. There are opposing opinions on a number of questions, and work proceeds with difficulty.

There is, however, a way out of this situation, Stepanov said. He said that the attitude of such a large political force in parliament as the "Communists of Russia" group should be taken into consideration. To this day, it has not yet being given due consideration. For instance, Soviet parliamentary leaders have not yet found an opportunity to meet with "Communists of Russia" to try to establish a "normal dialogue".

Stepanov said that this would be an important step towards settling conflicts. "I believe that this can still be done," he said.

Regarding the forthcoming extraordinary congress, Stepanov emphasised the importance of the Russian parliament's attitude. He expressed concern that unless constructive proposals are made, "the congress may turn into a political rally with unpredictable results of voting".

"I would not want the confrontation that manifested itself at Russian parliament to spark the split of society, civic confrontation in the republic", he said. "We shall not solve any problems unless we take a constructive road. This is the responsibility of all deputies, no matter to which group they belong."

Paper Alleges Defections Greater Tnan Admitted

PM2802163691 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 6, 10-17 Feb 91 p 2

[Unattributed report: "Perm: Polozkov's 'Dead Souls'"]

[Text] About 40 percent of the communists at Perm's factories, and more than 20 percent in the entire region, have left the Communist Party, the local press reports. This makes it possible to question a recent statement by Ivan Polozkov, the leader of Russia's communists, who in a radio interview, said that the Communist Party of the Russian Federation has lost only 600,000 of its members.

This is about 6 percent of its highest estimated membership. According to sociologists, the Perm Region holds a central position in the Russian Republic in terms of many indices. Even if we suppose that the region is an example of radicalism. In that case, to have only a 6 percent reduction of Party membership in the Federation as a whole, there must be regions which are witnessing a substantial growth in membership in the Russian Communist Party. Probably no such facts have been registered, otherwise the Party press would have certainly reported them. In fact, not a mere 600,000 members, but around 2 million communists have left the Party. Polozkov must be dreaming up a new version of Gogol's immortal "Dead Souls".

Silayev Meets With Turkish Businessmen

LD2702233291 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1348 GMT 27 Feb 91

[By TASS correspondent Azer Dzhangirov]

[Text] Istanbul, 27 Feb (TASS)—I.S. Silayev, chairman of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Council of Ministers, who is in Turkey on an official visit at the head of a republican governmental delegation, met with representatives of the country's business circles on Tuesday. During this meeting Nikhat Gekyigit, chairman of the Turkish-Soviet Business Council, noted the existence of great potential opportunities for the development of mutually advantageous cooperation between Turkey and the Russian Federation. The representatives of local business circles made specific proposals regarding implementation of the accords reached during the visit to Turkey by the RSFSR delegation. At the same time, critical remarks were made at the meeting by Turkish businessmen regarding Soviet foreign trade organizations, and it was also pointed out that bureaucratic and legal impediments to setting up joint enterprises and developing cross-border trade still continue to exist.

In his speech the head of the Russian Government spoke about measures for the transition of the country's economy to market relations and about extensive opportunities offered in connection with this for the direct access of enterprises and organizations in the RSFSR to the world market. I.S. Silayev called upon Turkish partners to set up small enterprises for processing raw materials—primarily in agriculture—as well as in the services sphere, on Russian territory.

In the course of the visit, I.S. Silayev took part in a ceremony signing a barter agreement amounting to $45 million between the committee for foreign economic ties of Checheno-Ingushetia and the Turkish firm "Korem," according to which Turkish consumer goods will be supplied to the republic in exchange for petroleum products.

On the same day the chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers visited a number of enterprises in Istanbul and had conversations with the heads of Turkish firms and holdings.

Delegation Ends Turkey Visit

LD0103011191 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1735 GMT 28 Feb 91

[By TASS correspondent Yalchin Ali-Zade]

[Excerpts] Ankara, 27 Feb (TASS)—Ivan Silayev, chairman of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Council of Ministers, said today in an interview given to a TASS correspondent after the completion of talks by a Russian Government delegation in the Turkish capital: "I think that Russia and Turkey have far more points of contact and possibilities for fruitful cooperation than many other states."

"Turkey was chosen to visit," noted the head of the Russian Government, "because we wanted to personally learn about the results of economic reforms that have been conducted here since the beginning of the 1980's. We wanted to understand the mechanism of transformation in the economy and to familiarize ourselves with the experience of a neighboring country in this regard. Despite the differences in political and social systems, our countries have much in common."

Ivan Silayev noted that the delegation learned a great deal that is useful for the RSFSR in the economic sphere. [passage omitted]

Today, after completing its four-day visit to Turkey, the RSFSR Government delgations left Istanbul for home.

Silayev Chairs Agricultural Workers' Meeting

LD0303024191 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 2230 GMT 2 Mar 91

[Text] Agricultural workers of the Volga and Urals area held a conference on 2 March. It was chaired by Silayev, chairman of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Council of Ministers. Speakers talked about the decrease in the yield during recent years, the reduction of areas sown under wheat, potatoes, and vegetables, and about the decrease in cattle and pigs. As a result, from 15 to 20 percent of meat, milk, eggs, and other important agricultural goods were undersupplied to the republican population in January and February compared with last year. The situation is aggravated by low supplies of agricultural produce, which causes some towns and oblasts to make do with a beggarly ration. Silayev informed participants in the conference in detail about the measures being undertaken by the RSFSR government for stimulating the production of agricultural produce.

Comments on Meeting Goals

LD0303034691 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1800 GMT 2 Mar 91

[Remark by Ivan Stepanovich Silayev, chairman of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Council of Ministers, to an unidentified correspondent in Samara 2 March; from the "Vremya" newscast—recorded]

[Text] We have fulfilled the tasks that we set for this conference, which were to listen to the managers of farms and leaders of oblasts, and to listen to scientists and to science. We hoped to draw additional conclusions of some kind on adopting strategic measures. We have carried out this task. But I did not set the task of listening to aspirations for new reforms, for the active implementation of land reform. Unfortunately, the prereform traditions and approaches are still deep-seated. We should not be surprised about this. We spent too long acquiring and inculcating the principles of centralization and of administrative management. The reverberations from this can be heard today. Nevertheless, peasants are a category of people who feel to a greater extent the need to work and to devote their strength to the land. Naturally, they need support. The fact that they understand us now—in their hearts, as they say, and in their thoughts, and in their deeds—and are ready to take part in the organization of the land reform is something that we now understand. Prolonged work lies ahead for all of us to restructure in line with these principles.

Stresses Need To Help Agriculture

LD0303035891 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 2000 GMT 2 Mar 91

[Text] I have been regularly informing you about the visit of Ivan Silayev, chairman of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet, to Samara Oblast. As you know, his visit was covered by our correspondent Sergey Milyanchikov, who accompanied the delegation. Our correspondent returned to Moscow today and has prepared a detailed report. I am going to ask him to speak. Please, Sergey, go ahead.

[Begin recording] [Milyanchikov] Two days have passed getting acquainted with the agriculture of the Volga region, in hundreds of kilometers travelled and in scores of meetings carried out with agricultural workers. I would like to remind you that this is the first visit by a leader of the republican government to Samara, which used to be called Kuybishev, in the last seven years.

There are many unsolved problems in the city, but I will not name them once again. The problems with foodstuffs are the same as throughout the republic. This is happening here where the black soil layer is almost a meter thick. A meeting of the leaders of the agricultural enterprise complex of a number of regions of Russia opened in Samara yesterday. Ivan Silayev began the meeting by visiting the holdings, as a contrast to the many other meetings where visiting the holdings was considered to be a supplement to the cultural program.

He examined the technical equipment at the Volzhskiy machine-testing station, where new technology is being worked out for the whole of the Volga region; got acquainted with the work of a pedigree enterprise; met with the workers of the agrocombine Volzhskiy; and visited the branches of the Uritskiy collective farm and the shops of the Tolyati meat-processing combine. The itinerary was so tight that we got the chance to speak to Ivan Stepanovich only on the bus during the travels between collective farms.

[Silayev] I am most worried about the present state of the problems with foodstuffs. There has been no progress in these problems and there are no grounds to speak of any positive moves taking place. The state of the fields also adds to the worries and the present climatic conditions are promising great complexities and difficulties in the work of the countryside. That is why this is so important. As we have some days before the beginning of the active days in the countryside, it is important to assess everything again and to consult on how we should work in such a situation to not only stop the situation from getting worse, but to adopt radical measures to make things better. This is the main task.

Second, it is very important to see, understand, and feel how the people live and how they react to our actions, both correct and incorrect, which also happens. These are only natural processes. It is important to introduce some corrections, to take things into account, and in some cases, simply to rectify things.

[Milyanchikov] What I noticed was that Ivan Silayev had come not to teach the agricultural workers how they should work, but to get to know their problems. During the meetings with managers of the holdings he never failed to ask how he could help.

[Silayev] When I asked this and offered help, I did not mean millions in hard currency, I primarily meant how could they be helped to untie their hands. For example, we can resolve the problem of beneficial taxation, or perhaps remove it altogether for some time, to give them initiative, independence, and energy.

[Milyanchikov] Nonetheless, this is a specific resolution for specific holdings. But what does the Russian Government intend to undertake for the agriculture of the republic as a whole?

[Silayev] This year we will have to bring in city dwellers, and think before hand about bringing in the army. I am not a believer of turning city dwellers into participants in technological [word indistinct] of agricultural cultures. But now we are doing precisely this. This is illogical. When there such critical moments in some places, one has to go. This includes the army. Everyone has to help.

It would have been more effective last year if all this had been thought out before. This year we will try to think this through. Thus, the support for new forms and the beginning of the implementation of the program through the budget and other financing of the main collective farm and state farm forms today, plus the fulfilment of former points and, to some extent, administrative points will allow us to stabilize ourselves, so that next year we can begin active movement to increase food production. I am sure. Naturally, everyone needs to roll up their shirtsleeves.

We must continue to arm our countryside with equipment, the necessary laws, and support by suitable actions on financial, material, and other bases for the active development of farms.

[Milyanchikov] At present there is disagreement as to what our agriculture should be like—farm, leasehold, collective farm, or state farm. Here is the opinion of the Russian premier:

[Silayav] I am not a supporter, as is attributed to us, of getting rid of the collective farms and state farms. Moreover, tomorrow we will carry out talks with representatives of collective holdings, both state farms and collective farms. Nonetheless, I think that by autumn farmers will make a certain contribution if we give them the opportunity to form and develop.

I think that a tenfold increase in the number of farm holdings can be predicted by the end of the year, [words indistinct] can be predicted. I may be mistaken, but not by more than 5,000. That is what I think.

[Milyanchikov] On Saturday, the participants in the conference gathered together to take account of the bitter experience of past years; to decide how to grow, gather, and conserve this year's harvest. Quite honestly, at times it was incomprehensible to some economic planners, who thought that they would be given equipment, building materials, money, or hard currency. No. So far the Russian Government does not have this. But the government can help to resolve some basic questions, said Ivan Silayev at the conclusion of the meeting. The organizers had not hoped to resolve all the problems that have built up in our agriculture for the past 70 years, but the main thing is that it was necessary to meet, discuss, and resolve the most urgent problems, so that the mistakes of last year are not repeated this year, when, despite a record harvest, the republic ended up with empty granaries. Judging by how the Russian Government has approached this problem, there is hope that there will be a harvest this year. [end recording]

Moldovan Deputies Appeal to RSFSR Legislature

LD0203011691 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1620 GMT 1 Mar 91

[By TASS correspondent Fedor Angeli]

[Text] Kishinev, 1 Mar (TASS)—A group of Moldova deputies has appealed to Russian deputies to abstain from the ratification of the agreement between the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] and Moldova until amendments are introduced on the right of the Russians living in Moldova to hold dual nationality (in the RSFSR and in Moldova Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR]) irrespective of whether or not they hold USSR citizenship.

In their document, they say that the ratification of the agreement in the form that it was signed will not ensure the rights of national minorities in the Moldova SSR, including the Russians.

The Moldovan deputies are drawing the attention of their Russian colleagues to the legislative activities of the Moldovan Supreme Soviet. Even after ratification of this agreement, the Moldovan legislation still leads to violations of human rights, including that on the basis of nationality. For example, the law on migration, already adopted by the Moldovan legislature, in essence forbids the representatives of other nationalities entry to Moldova for settlement, which includes those wishing to join their families. At the same time, a purposeful campaign aimed at getting dual Moldovan and Romanian citizenship is being carried out in the press, especially the parliamentary press.

The law on citizenship has been adopted in its first reading, notes the appeal, but it does not recognize dual nationality. If this law is adopted in this form, many thousands of people of non-Moldovan nationality who will not get Moldovan citizenship, will lose their right to receive land. The law on property, which was adopted by the Moldova SSR Supreme Soviet, offers the right of land ownership only to Moldovan citizens.

Kemerovo Oblast Democrats Hold First Meeting

PM0103125591 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 27 Feb 91 Union Edition p 2

[Report by Viktor Kostyukovskiy under the "Direct Line" rubric: "'Democratic Kuzbass' Bloc of Deputies"]

[Text] Kemerovo—An organizational meeting of people's deputies belonging to 'Democratic Kuzbass' has been held.

Forty-five oblast soviet deputies launched this initiative. They include workers, employees, soviet personnel, economic leaders, doctors, journalists, and representatives of other parties and movements, including the workers' movement.

An appeal signed by this group reads: "The propaganda of the ruling union structures accuses democrats of destroying society. However, recent events have clearly shown who really holds the levers of power and how the ideas of a free society, a market economy, and the sovereignty of republics are being deliberately discredited..."

The initiators urged fellow deputies of all the oblast's soviets who share these views to unite in a bloc of democratic forces capable of halting reaction and "wishing to see a revived Russia occupy a worthy place among the other peoples."

Gidaspov Comments on 23 Feb Leningrad Rally

PM2702152091 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 26 Feb 91 Second Edition p 6

[Report by correspondent N. Volynskiy under the rubric "Commentary on an Event": "After the 'Storming' of the Smolnyy"]

[Text] Leningrad—An unauthorized demonstration organized in Leningrad 23 February by the civil resistance movement and ending in a "rehearsal" for the storming of the Smolnyy had wide echoes, not only in the city on the Neva. As PRAVDA has already reported, this action was organized mainly by members of the local section of the Democratic Union and certain other political parties. Leningrad City Soviet deputies also took part. Beforehand, I. Kucherenko, deputy chairman of Leningrad City Soviet, announced that it had been decided not to give permission for the march, but not to stop it either, only to take proceedings against the organizers afterward...

I asked B. Gidaspov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and first secretary of Leningrad party obkom [oblast committee], to assess what happened.

"We have seen recently," Boris Veniaminovich declared, "that actions of this kind are never spontaneous. They are prepared beforehand, and thoroughly at that. A backbone has formed of virtually the same people, who attend these events. People who are just passing by also join in. The organizers are a permanent contingent, functionaries of various noncommunist parties. There are not so very many of them, perhaps a few hundred. But because any event that occurs in Palace Square attracts some attention, groups form—in this case, some 2,000 people assembled, and they moved toward the Smolnyy.

"It is not a question of numbers, but the objective. And the objective is always the same: the collapse of the Soviet Union, come what may. And therefore it is no accident that all the onslaughts and all the actions are aimed at discrediting our symbols. First they burn the red flag in Palace Square, then they proclaim the demand to rename Leningrad or nationalize party property. Recently, the constant theme has been 'Give back the Smolnyy!' True, they do not say who it should be given back to. And why given back? Given back—to Nicholas II, do they mean? Or perhaps it would be better to give it back to the Daughters of the Nobility [the Smolnyy formerly housed a school for girls from noble families]? But the authors of such demands know very well that property questions are not decided by rallies, referendums, the raising of hands, or resolutions. They are decided through the courts and the state arbitration system."

[Volynskiy] "But is there a real danger that the Smolnyy could be seized by a mob?"

[Gidaspov] "We feel safe. We know and feel our own strength very well, chiefly our moral strength. True, we are being offered practical help—by labor collectives, party members, and entire party organizations. But we think that, first, the organizers of 'storm' actions should have more common sense. Second, there is the law, there is the Leningrad City Soviet and the oblast soviet, there are the militia organs, which are obliged to maintain order in the city..."

Here is what I was told by Militia Colonel P. Rezinkin, deputy chief of the public order administration:

"The militia was put in an ambiguous position by the city soviet's decision not to give permission for the so-called alternative rally, but...not to stop it either. As a result urban transport was stopped and the city suffered. The RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Criminal Code includes an article under which the disruption of public transport is punishable.

Militia organs drew up statements on the offenders and organizers of the unauthorized rally, V. Terekhov, I. Soshnikov, V. Tsytovits, and A. Bolgarov, and their cases are being handed over to the courts. A statement has also been drawn up on Leningrad City Soviet Deputy V. Skoybeda..."

South Russia Cities Form Association

LD0403224291 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 4 Mar 91

[Text] Another association has appeared in our country. In this case, it is an association of cities and towns of south Russia. The founding conference opened in Krasnodar today. Delegations from 15 cities and towns including Rostov, Stavropol, Voronezh, Volgogorad, Nalchik and Saratov are taking part in the conference. A rise in the output of consumer goods on the basis of cooperation by the industrial enterprises of the cities and towns of south Russia will become one of the main tasks of the association.

Association for Economic Policy Set Up in South

LD0203050291 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 2000 GMT 1 Mar 91

[Text] An association to implement a single economic policy in the field of price formation, the fulfillment of planned deliveries, and a joint approach toward the problems of supply and joint entrepreneurship has been set up in the southern Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR]. At a meeting today in Rostov-na-Donu, the association was officially established in writing.

Among the urgent tasks is the setting up of a joint information service with a databank on raw materials and reserve capabilities. The next step is the setting up of an interregional commodities and shares exchange.

Nikolay Kondratenko, chairman of Krasnodar Kray Soviet of People's Deputies and the founding father of the association, categorically denied in an interview with a TASS correspondent that there is any confrontation between the new economic association and RSFSR leaders.

Stavropol Leaseholders Form Union

LD2802192991 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1000 GMT 28 Feb 91

[Text] A union of leaseholders and entrepreneurs of Stavropol kray has been set up. The new organization will help businessmen to pool their efforts. At the same time, the union will protect them economically and socially. Our correspondent notes that in Stavropol kray a committee for land reform is already working, and a committee for managing state property is being created.

Enterprises Set Up Independent Concern

PM0503095791 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 26 Feb 91 Union Edition p 1

[V. Kulagin report: "Independent 'Soyuzpechat' Set Up"]

[Text] Orel—More than 60 "Soyuzpechat" [Main Administration for the Distribution of Printed Matter] enterprises in Russia's autonomous republics, krays, and oblasts have decided to withdraw from the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Ministry of Communications, Information Science, and Space, and set up an independent association to distribute and dispatch the periodical press.

The association's organizational committee has been set up. It is headed by the chief of the Orel Oblast "Soyuzpechat" enterprise, Aleksey Visyagin.

"We have been forced to take this step under the threat of our enterprises being completely swallowed up by the postal department," the chairman of the organizational committee says. "The other day we received agreement for the central 'Soyuzpechat' retail and subscription agency to become part of our association also. Now we have begun preparation for an all-Russian conference of the founders of the concern."

In leaving the RSFSR Ministry of Communications, which is not interested in the growth of the circulation of publications and their delivery, the association as a trading organization will be directly dependent on the circulation growth of papers and journals: The higher the commodity turnover, the greater the revenue. The association will work directly for the publishers and readers, paying for the services of postal workers on behalf of the publishing houses. Then, A. Visyagin believes, it will be possible not just to request but to demand improvement in the quality of the delivery services for printed output to millions of readers.

Western Republics

PRAVDA on Gorbachev at Belorussian Academy

PM0103125791 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 1 Mar 91 Second Edition pp 1-2

[Unattributed report: "No to Confrontation and a Split in Society, Yes to Constructive Cooperation! M.S. Gorbachev's Meeting With Representatives of Belorussia's Scientific and Creative Intelligentsia"]

[Text] Opening the meeting, Academician V. Platonov, president of the Belorussian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Academy of Sciences, talked about reorganizing the work of research centers, about attracting talented young people into science, and about the difficulties of financing fundamental research, which could have irreparable consequences for science.

Academician Ye. Konoplya of the Belorussian SSR Academy of Sciences talked about Belorussian academics' participation in the struggle against the consequences of the Chernobyl disaster. He stressed that academy institutions have amassed a great deal of experience in assessing the medical consequences of the impact of small doses of radiation on people, and noted the need to set up an international radiological and radio-ecological research center in Belorussia, which would make it possible to more actively involve the international scientific community in solving the problems of Chernobyl.

The writer I. Chigrinov and Academicians A. Goncharenko, L. Sushchenya, and I. Lishtvan of the Belorussian SSR Academy of Sciences raised acute issues connected with the conclusion of a new Union treaty and focused attention on the alarming processes of the disintegration of Soviet science and scientists' loss of prestige.

The great responsibility borne by creative workers for deepening democratic transformations in society and for preserving and enriching the fruitful traditions of friendship between the country's peoples was also noted at the meeting.

M.S. Gorbachev addressed the scientists and cultural figures.

I have long planned to visit Belorussia. I was drawn to your republic by a sense of human, civic duty and by a desire to meet with its talented, industrious, and courageous people. I cannot fail to mention the Belorussian people's heroic history, their character, endurance, and contribution to everything that is accomplished in this land. I am not talking now about the casualties and losses that this people have suffered. Leaning on the arm of fraternal aid, they have truly risen from the ashes after losing so many lives, whole cities, and thousands of villages and settlements.

I am thinking now about Belorussia as it is today. Belorussians are showing their character now, too. I would not say that they immediately rushed into the lists as soon as they heard the word "perestroyka." That would be wrong. But I have been watching the republic, your party organization, and your science and culture, and I have seen that Belorussians have accepted perestroyka and become involved in it.

I very much value this approach by people to serious matters and I am terribly distrustful of those who get "worked up," rush into things without hardly listening, and put forward hasty concepts. I am distrustful of those who have a ready-made answer for everything which they are even not averse to proposing as a recipe for the overnight salvation of the fatherland. I do not respect such people, since they are preventing us from accomplishing a most enormous and difficult task.

First and foremost, I had to come here to have a long discussion with you and to consult with you. I have visited Belorussia before, but not in the way required by the times. I regret that for a long time I have been unable to visit you again, particularly after the disaster that befell you. We did not know everything about its scale and its consequences. Perhaps even now we do not know everything about it. Chernobyl and the safety of nuclear power are global problems.

It is well known that France, for instance, gets most of its electricity from nuclear power stations. There are nuclear power stations throughout Europe. The U.S. has thought about it and has again started implementing its new energy program based on the construction of nuclear stations. All studies show that we, too, cannot do without nuclear power, that we cannot bid farewell to our nuclear power generators. It is, therefore, all the more important that we weigh everything and check and recalculate things a thousand times. We must draw conclusions for Belorussia and for everyone, bearing in mind that this applies to the fate not only of the present generation, but of future generations, too.

I want to devote two of my three days in Belorussia to Gomel and Mogilev Oblasts. I want to look, listen, and comprehensively digest things once again, because ahead lie the main problems which we will have to solve.

We have warmly welcomed the vigorous work being done by your republic's academy and authorities to prepare a law on social protection for the victims of the Chernobyl disaster. A preliminary [rabochiy] version of the law has now been prepared based on your ideas and proposals from the Ukraine and Russia. It is being examined by experts in the Cabinet of Ministers and by USSR Supreme Soviet committees. After further work it will be submitted to the Supreme Soviet. I have been told in Moscow, and N.I. Dementey has confirmed it here, that the approaches in both laws—the law adopted by the republic and the Union law which is under preparation—coincide.

I am very pleased about the exchange of opinions being held here. When people talk about what concerns them, this is particularly valuable. The introductory speech by your academy's president was important and substantive, the other comrades raised important issues, too.

I can see that everyone is particularly concerned about the impossibility of development without integrating the economy, science, and culture. This integration is enormously important. After all, everything that is positive in the processes of democratization, decentralization, and the implementation of the freedom of enterprises, labor collectives, scientific institutions, and republics will, if divorced from a balanced system, inevitably go to the other extreme. That is why I welcome the view that we should remember that we all need each other, that we share a common destiny, that we face common problems, and that we can only solve them together.

Indeed, do we really need to return the state to a condition reminiscent of the times of Ivan Kalita [Prince Ivan I] so as to start everything from scratch? I said this to workers today and I repeat it now: I do not believe that we can go our separate ways as easily and simply as some people think. People would meet at night, raise their hands, vote, and everything would be settled. This would be an adventure rather than politics. The subject of disintegration is the most dangerous subject of all. It is a path that leads to civil conflict, and I do not know how we will work out who is going to live where, where different borders lie, and what we are going to do with the 75 million people living outside "their own" republics. Only lunatics would encourage this process.

Now, I will admit, we are meeting at my request. I have prepared for this meeting and have specially drawn up a speech on a topical problem of concern to me. I would like to discuss it with you.

The Fourth Congress of USSR People's Deputies has been held. Do you remember how heated the debates were? They started with a vote of confidence in the president. The discussion was direct and open, and major decisions were made. It is little more than two months since then, and we are again hearing: "What is happening? Where are we headed? What future awaits us?"

This is probably nothing to be surprised about. I conclude that we have not reached the peak of the crisis. We have difficult work ahead and hard decisions which will affect everyone. I need only mention price reform, denationalization, the referendum on the fate of the Union, and the discussion of the draft new Union treaty.

Questions of immense scale and importance are being decided. It is understandable that people want to get a better handle on what is happening, so as to make decisions and act confidently. Disputes, discussions, and even, if you like, a certain intellectual ferment is natural at this crucial period which we are now going through.

Let us state directly that we are short of time and have plenty of problems. In accordance with the congress decisions we are shaping a new structure for organs of power. The Cabinet of Ministers has started work and is beginning to develop its activities. Even at its first sittings we dealt with the most topical questions, such as power generation, metallurgy, transportation, and food—everything without which the entire country would grind to a halt and be paralyzed.

The first steps have been taken to implement the program of transition to the market approved by the congress. Experience of work in the new Federation Council is also being built up. Work on the draft Union treaty has moved ahead. A Security Council will be set up and start work in the very near future.

Far-reaching changes are also taking place in the republics. A great deal of diversity has been seen—life will show what comes of it and which forms will stand the test of time. The country's labor collectives have been working under very difficult conditions in the first few months of the year. The problems which have emerged in their activity as a result of the violation of economic ties are building up. Despite every effort, the country is simply failing to overcome these difficulties, and in a number of areas the situation is not only failing to improve, but is actually becoming menacing.

So what is the problem? There is no single answer to this question. One factor, speaking in terms of the most important issues, is the complexity of the tasks we are tackling. We still have to learn a great deal, because you cannot master new ways of living with the old approach and the old knowledge. Miracles do not happen, you cannot jump in a single bound from the authoritarian edict system to democracy, from a distributive economy to the market system, from a unitary state to a federation of sovereign republics.

Another factor is the mistakes in the formulation and implementation of the reforms. We made a lot of blunders while we were looking for the right approach to economic development and the problems of state building. The decisions that we have now adopted and begun to implement did not come easily.

All the same, when we speak of the factors determining the present complex condition of society, it is important to stress that we are already seeing ways of resolving the problems that have arisen. But in the last 12-18 months the efforts we have made have to a significant extent been blocked by the extremely fierce power struggle that has broken out. That, Comrades, is the crux of the present moment. That is why I want to dwell, in my speech, on questions of the distribution of political forces and the nature of the political struggle that is being imposed on us.

Let me begin by saying that we will not be able to get to the bottom of the current events unless we abandon the obsolete idea that everything that happens in the country depends on the will of the guiding center. Even in pre-perestroyka times that was only partly true. Even then, factors were in operation that neither the party, nor even totalitarian power itself could keep absolutely under control.

Today, now that a fundamental renewal of state structures has begun, new sociopolitical currents have emerged—and now parties too—and freedom of the press has become a reality. What is happening now—both good and bad—is not taking place at the behest of someone's supreme will. It is the result of a highly complex interaction and struggle of political forces. The political struggle became particularly tough when perestroyka approached its decisive stage—the redistribution of power and property on a democratic basis.

Let me remind you how events developed. At the first stage the party renounced the monopoly of power and its concentration in the hands of the general secretary and the Politburo. Increasingly broad social strata gradually became involved in decisionmaking—through new forms of democracy and glasnost, through elections and the creation of new representative bodies. That happened at the central and republic level and at the local level.

Simultaneously with the transfer of power from a narrow stratum to the whole of society, a process of decentralization was taking place. As a result of the democratization of the national state structure, very powerful forces were released—local initiative, the desire for national rebirth. This added new doses of energy to all the processes, acting as a catalyst, and this process was boosted by the widening of the republics' rights and their proclamations of sovereignty. The peoples' right to self-determination and self-management is now recognized in law, and we have entered the phase of transformation of the Union into a federation of sovereign republics.

After these profound changes in the political sphere, the process of change in the economic system and, most significantly, in ownership, was speeded up. A quest began, and is still going on, for forms of economic life that make it possible to give people full proprietorship of the means of production and the land, to overcome alienation, and to start up powerful labor incentives. Here, you could say, we have climbed up step by step. Remember: First there was economic accountability [khozraschet] and self-financing, then the gradual switch from the centralized, planning method of supplying resources to the wholesale method. Then cooperatives, the lease system, and in the end we came all the way to the dismantling of state ownership and the issuing of shares and began the real transition to the market.

All this happened in a short time. But before that, the implementation of economic reform had clashed with the system of administration and the institutions of power. Then we went to the party conference and acknowledged the need for political reform to clear the way for perestroyka in the economy.

Two years have passed. New political movements and parties have appeared in our country. This is a normal process. We have said that we renounce the CPSU's monopoly of power, that we welcome political pluralism, in which various social strata and groups can express and uphold their interests through parties, trade unions, and other organizations. But this must be within the framework of legitimate procedures, in constitutional form. That is the ABC of perestroyka. The party has won the position of ruling party—let it proclaim its policy and implement it, resting on the support of its positions in society.

It must, however, be noted that in the conditions of our fragile, not yet strong democracy, certain political currents that have formed have begun to seek the implementation of their plans not within a constitutional framework and with the help of the existing rule of law, but despite it. Here lies, in essence, the drama of the present situation and the root of the difficulties we are experiencing. Impatience and radicalism have turned into intolerance and aggression. Instead of progress toward a mixed economy, people try to pursue the adventurist demand for total privatization and a transition to total domination by private ownership. They try to transform the peoples' legitimate desire for autonomy and national rebirth into nationalist self-isolation and autarky.

The "war of laws" that has been unleashed in line with this ideology has largely paralyzed power, undermined the market, and disrupted real links that had developed over the decades. Attacks on the Congress of People's Deputies, the USSR Supreme Soviet, and the president have been stepped up. A paradoxical situation has arisen in which people who have deviated a long way from the course of perestroyka and seek basically to change its aims and guidelines, are accusing the center of allegedly curtailing the reforms and preparing for a dictatorship. In reality a power struggle is in progress, ignoring the demands of the law and moral norms, destabilizing the situation, and threatening to divert us from the path of reforms onto the path of confrontation. Until this situation, which is intolerable from the viewpoint of the life of society and the state, is eliminated, the crisis will deepen, running the risk of developing into civil war and drastically weakening the country, if not plunging it back by decades.

People may say: If the shelves in the stores are filled and the process of economic degradation is stopped, all the problems will resolve themselves. But the shelves cannot be filled without the imposition of law and order in the country, without stability. The general conclusion of prestigious scholars from many countries is that a successful transition to the market cannot be achieved in conditions of chaos and disruption. Yet it is through the reform of ownership, progress toward the market, and the transformation of the Union that we want to achieve new forms of life and secure a different dynamic in the country's development. Without cohesion, without the purposeful will of the majority of the people, these tasks will be beyond us. That is the essence of the complexity and drama of the present situation.

In this connection, I must speak with regret of the evolution undergone by our democratic movements that began so well. Even today there are a good many progressively minded people under their banners, people who sincerely desire the good of the fatherland and care about their country's present and future. The trouble is, however, that the slogans that inspired these active perestroyka forces have to a large extent been emasculated and altered and are being used as cover for different, far-reaching plans.

The groups that act under the flag of democracy are diverse, but their leaders' program principles have emerged clearly enough. Where are they trying to lead us, to what end do they at least offer their services, these newly fledged "friends of the people"? The first thesis in their program is defederalization, which implies the fragmentation of our great multinational state. One of the democrats' ideologists, Moscow City Soviet

Chairman G. Popov, speaks frankly, without emotion and without, so to speak, betraying any feelings, about the possibility of the division of the Soviet Union into 40 or 50 states, the resettlement of entire peoples, and the redrawing of borders between republics. This anti-Union and antipopular plan is passed off as the creed of democracy. Moreover, the program principles are followed by political actions. I am talking about the frantic attacks on the center, that is, the attempts to cast aspersions on the Union itself and on the referendum about the future of our multinational state, and not only to cast aspersions, but to try to supplant its aims.

See what attacks it is subjected to at individual forums. It is no wonder that "democrats" are entering into a political alliance with separatists and nationalist groups. They have a common aim: to weaken the Union and, if successful, to make it collapse. No matter that the reputation of extremists in "Sajudis" or "Rukh" is not irreproachable. Allies can be forgiven even such "peccadilloes" as organizing moral and in a number of cases even armed terror against people who speak different languages and think different thoughts, demolishing memorials to Soviet servicemen, and propagandizing profascist views. There is evidently more than enough such base reading matter in your republic, too.

Today it is possible to state that so-called democrats have recently adopted an overtly anticommunist course. The appeal to all patriotic forces interested in the country's fate, which was made in the Program Statement of the 28th CPSU Congress, inviting them to cooperate in this sphere, has been left hanging in mid-air. The "democrats" reject this path. At the same time, what we are talking about here is not only the rejection of the CPSU's ideological position—you can say that this is a personal matter for everybody—but appeals to declare it a "criminal organization" and to put it on trial. This with regard to 16 million people, to the party which itself began eliminating its monopoly on power and opened up the way to democratization and glasnost.

What is the worth of sneering exercises over the "socialist choice" formula: What choice can there be, they say, if we do not know what socialism represents? I must say that what lies behind these arrogant sniggers is either ignorance or something else—for they are, as a rule, doctors or academicians. No, of course it is not a matter of ignorance. It is impossible to believe that democrat-ideologues, in rejecting Marx, Engels, and Lenin, have heard nothing about the contemporary socialist trends which are developing strongly in the world. As is known, international associations exist in the socialist movement, too.

Without going into details on this big topic, I will say this. People frequently rebuke me: Enough of swearing that you, a Communist, favor the socialist choice. But this is a matter of principle for me. I have nothing to do with those people who yesterday warmed themselves at one fire and today at another and who feel equally comfortable. Their morality, conscience, and convictions depend on people. For us the socialist choice is not words designed just somehow to symbolize a link with the past, but a perfectly clear and definite image of the future.

In speaking of this, what we have in mind, above all, are humanist values, rights, and freedoms and an orientation toward the person as the chief value. We also have in mind the democratic structure of society, the parliamentary system, the principle of the division of powers, the creation of a rule-of-law state, and the triumph of the law. Finally, we have in mind a mixed economy and diverse forms of ownership with social justice and solidarity.

I cannot fail to mention opposition attempts to appropriate the slogans of democracy as their individual property. If B.N. Yeltsin and G.Kh. Popov call themselves democrats, then millions of Communists have far greater grounds for doing so. There is the informal question, too. Representatives of this trend call themselves "left-wingers," and they have even proposed to the center the creation of a bloc—the left center—because, they say, they are "left" of center, more radical. OK, let us give this some thought, for the time has come to clarify this matter. Since the time of the French Revolution, when such terminology came into political use, what has been meant by "left-wingers" is defenders of the social lower classes and, in the modern epoch, champions of socialism and communism. This is generally accepted terminology. "Democrats", however, deny not only the totalitarian model of socialism which we had in the past and which the party itself has rejected, but also reject the socialist idea and advocate the capitalization of society. Is it not clear that in them we are dealing with a typical right-wing opposition? Things must be called by their proper names.

In creating the new state structure which presupposes socialist pluralism, we realized that sooner or later there would be formed in the country trends such as left-wing, right-wing, center, or, to put it another way, democrats, conservatives, liberals, etc. It was perfectly possible to forecast this. But here is a paradox associated with a special feature of the process taking place here. An innately right-wing political force has adopted means of struggle characteristic of left-wing radicals. This is explained simply: The "democrats" are straining for power. Since the original intention of seizing it in a lightning manner by legitimate means—through the Congress of People's Deputies and the Supreme Soviet—failed, they have decided to employ what certain analysts are now calling "neo-Bolshevist tactics."

You understand what I am talking about. It involves destroying state structures, shifting the struggle to the streets, organizing demonstrations, rallies, strikes, and hunger strikes, creating a psychological atmosphere which would put representatives of other political movements off their stride. In the last few weeks we have been able to observe the height of this tactic. After giving a distorted interpretation of the dramatic events in the Baltic region and then of the actions of the Union authorities in strengthening law and order—I mean the well-known USSR presidential decrees, which they greatly dislike—right-wingers let out a heart-rending shout about approaching dictatorship and even a threat of a coup d'etat.

Think about it, what cynicism! A coup is being talked about by people who almost since the First Congress of USSR People's Deputies have been demanding the dissolution of this democratically elected organ of power, the first one in the history of our state, and the elimination of the USSR Supreme Soviet. And what assessment can be made of attempts to rectify their falling political rating and to make their presence felt by raising up a new destructive wave in society?

Within the framework of the new political culture which is being acquired you and I want to hold a discussion, to compare positions, to criticize, etc. True, not everyone knows how to do this, and sometimes demands are made even on this side, so to speak, that they be "put down," as it were. What do they propose on the other side? They are waging a struggle against us from positions of psychological warfare. Lacking positive programs, they appeal to the people and the working class over the heads of legislatures. But the situation is tense, and they are reckoning on being able to "dissolve" the Supreme Soviet, to pension off the president... What then? For this is being done at a critical time in the state's existence, at a most crucial stage of profound transformations, when the people are on the verge of collapse. The question arises: Who is preparing a coup d'etat, who is calling for unconstitutional, nonparliamentary forms of political struggle?

We categorically reject any attempts to repeat a violent seizure of power, which would almost inevitably be followed by a civil war. I declare this resolutely, and I hope you understand what I am talking about. We have had lessons—both our own and other peoples'—in order to draw such a conclusion.

You will ask me: Can Communists speak negatively about manifestations of "neo-Bolshevism"? A valid question, and I will answer it. The point is that the situation today cannot be equated with what happened 73 years ago. Historians might argue over whether the party and its leadership acted correctly or incorrectly then by taking power and later dissolving the Constituent Assembly. But it cannot fail to be seen that it was a question of developing a revolution which had to answer the people's fundamental demands: land, peace, bread, ownership, freedom. The situation is quite different today. The ruling party has not only rejected monopoly power, it has proposed a program of radical reforms based on democratization, glasnost, the involvement of people in the transformation processes, and the rebirth of the peoples. These aims are being realized step by step, not without mistakes, not without difficulties. This is the meaning of perestroyka, and we do not intend to depart from this path.

Therefore, let us do away with illusions and naivete. We are operating under conditions when there is an opposition for which the only correct position is to censure everything that is being done because this does not accord with its program aims. First we hear shouts about the weakness of power and even about its paralysis. Then this power begins to take some steps and displays will and character, and at once there are shouts about excessive firmness and even a threat of dictatorship.

I want to repeat: The struggle is being waged not from positions of defense of the truth or constructive criticism, not from positions of the interests of society, but from positions of censure. What is the reason for the opposition leaders' reluctance to see the real picture and for their desire to make their own interpretation of everything? It is that the program of society's radical renewal within the framework of the socialist choice, which we are implementing unswervingly, step by step, no longer suits the forces behind these politicians. They themselves are hostages of these forces.

Point two. The opposition does not like it when reforms are carried out by someone else because it is trying not only to discredit the policy of the center, but also to torpedo as much as possible the measures it is taking. All this hurts the economy badly despite the furious efforts which we have been making together, it affects the activity of many republic organs and the search for correct mutual relations between the center and the republics. But we can see where the disintegration processes are leading. Unless we stop them and preserve the economic ties, which have already been considerably damaged, we can expect a fall in production with all its attendant consequences, first and foremost, social. The social consequences may be followed by political ones because the people will not tolerate this any longer.

Thus it is necessary to resolve all questions within the framework of the continuation of the perestroyka course, otherwise the disintegration and collapse of economic ties and the disruption of production will necessitate the adoption of drastic measures in general. We cannot allow that because the chaos will give rise to dictatorial methods and form of rule.

People are saying now that the problem or tragedy of the center and its leading light—the president and general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee—is that it will not make a choice and thus it is being roundly criticized both by the right and the left. I mean the center in the political sense, not the central organs of power. I think that it is time to clarify these concepts. We can all see that on the right and left flanks there are many people whose prime concern is to ensure that the country emerges from the crisis and to resolve the problems of the market, the normal functioning of enterprises, and the maintenance of economic ties. A split in society leading to civil conflicts resulting in casualties cannot be allowed.

In these conditions I believe that the most responsible, saving role falls to the political center, which is called on to prevent clashes between extreme positions and offer society a real way out of the crisis. It is always more difficult for the center. Here I want to agree with Aleksandr Isayevich Solzhenitsyn, who made an apt comment on this with great artistic force. Let us once more recall those words in the context of today's situation. "It is most difficult of all to draw the mean of social development: The raised voice, the fist, the bomb, the prison bars do not help as they do at the extremes. The mean demands the greatest composure, the firmest courage, the most careful patience, the most precise knowledge." That inscription should be hung up on a wall at the Academy of Sciences.

I want to stress that I understand the center not as some kind of geometric middle between two points. It is not a question of occupying some intermediate position equidistant from the extreme left and right. Such a position would be deprived of all dynamism, it would be dead. The center as I understand it is a vector whose aim is to transform society on new principles and which offers it a revolutionary perspective but not on the basis of setting one part against the other, not on a basis of confrontation, especially in which the other side is called the enemy, but on the basis of the cohesion of the overwhelming majority of society.

Common sense prevails in any society—that is the real basis of the political center. It may not be as a brash or bombastic as the extreme wings but it embraces the bulk of the people who are concerned about the fate of their country and will have the decisive say at the vital moment. We must not ignore their opinion. Herein lies the point of perestroyka—progressing via deep revolutionary reforms, not confrontation, not a new form of civil war. We have had enough of confrontation between whites and reds, blacks and blues, and so forth. We are one country, one society, and we must work in the framework of political pluralism and by comparing programs in front of the people so as to find the answers which would be in the fundamental interests of the country and propel it forward.

Those are the tasks of the political center and the aim of perestroyka. That is how I perceived things from the very outset despite the mistakes that were made, including those connected with omissions of mine. I am not about to change political course or position. I cannot accept the charge against the president of unwarranted vacillation and indecisiveness. I assure you that this is not the case. There is nothing simpler under the influence of emotions than yielding to the pressure of the mob, to be blunt, and making decisions in conditions of mob rule, so to speak, which could then prove to be a most serious calamity.

Next. It should not be forgotten that the post of president by its very nature makes it obligatory to take into account the opinions not of individual groups, but of the whole of society. I can say again to my dear party comrades in arms: Nowhere and before no audience am I ashamed to say that I am a Communist and committed to the socialist idea. It may be the death of me, as they say, but I shall remain true to it. I made my choice long ago and for all time. Not only I, but my father and grandfather did that. For me this question is resolved once and for all. But this of course does not mean that the president in exercising his functions should not make contact with different political tendencies and with those representatives who perhaps arouse dislike in all of us. All our Communists must see this, and the president's political stance must not be doubted.

We are proving that the idea which the Communist Party serves is a unifying idea expressing the interests of all strata of the people. Let us respect ourselves then. By the way, our party organizations should not turn into closed sects but conduct dialogue and find answers based on their own convictions and sound arguments. Arguments based on the truth and knowledge will ultimately find support in society.

To prevent the further deepening of confrontation, everyone must first stop acting according to the principle of "winners and losers". Essentially in the past few days we have seen the question posed in exactly those terms. Let us reject it publicly before everyone. We do not accept this principle. In so doing I am not calling for a reconciliation without principles, for a universal love-in, or something like that. No, in conditons of democracy political struggle is inevitable. But it must be waged within the bounds of legality, political culture, and a comparison of positions. As for those who are not mature enough for that—ultimately the people will work out whom they are dealing with and, in my opinion, they already are beginning to do so.

In today's extraordinary conditions there must, nevertheless, be some form of reconciliation so as to prevent a conflagration in our home. Despite the urgency of the situation, Comrades, there must be no panic. We face great dangers, but we also have enormous opportunities to take the situation in hand. When we have turned the corner we will be able to take the high road of normal development. The main thing is not to lose our way and not to have a head-on confrontation.

What must be done now? The anticrisis program must be implemented consistently.

First, it is a question of moving toward the market with strong social protection for people. The urgently needed changes in the system of prices and price formation must be accompanied by compensation and be carried out in conditions of extensive glasnost.

Second, it is a question of the gradual denationalization of property and the transition to a mixed economy.

giving priority to social forms of ownership but without anathematizing other forms of it.

Third, it is important to conclude a new Union treaty as soon as possible. Until the conclusion of the treaty, the USSR Constitution must be the only basis for all actions. The bodies of executive power from top to bottom must proceed on that basis and must resolve the problems that crop up in the framework of the laws and the corresponding political institutions.

Fourth, it is necessary to preserve the internal unity of the system of law enforcement organs and give them every support so as to put an end to organized crime in the main within 18 months to two years. This is one of the most acute problems today.

Fifth, there must be an immediate end to the eviction of the indigenous population from the territories of the republics which is being conducted by the adoption of unconstitutional laws and the persecution of citizens who speak a different language. The priority of the interests and rights of man over all others must be a permanent norm of life.

Sixth, we must consistently adhere to a united position among the republics in the world arena, and end the attempts to achieve unilateral advantage by playing off our own interests against others. The political struggle within the country should not spill over into the world arena.

There are mechanisms for implementing an anticrisis program—the Supreme Soviet, republic institutions, the Federation Council, and the Cabinet of Ministers, which is taking shape on new principles. The more effectively the center and the republics cooperate, the more effectively these mechanisms will operate. Acting in this way, we will solve the most acute problems and avoid what must not be permitted to happen. The axiom is that dictatorship is born of disorder, and democratic law and order is the most reliable guarantee against dictatorship.

One other point. Some in the USSR have been feeding foreigners the idea that dangerous changes are taking place in the country and that the perestroyka policy is being abandoned. World public opinion has been fed a story about looming dictatorship and there has been talk that, in such circumstances, normal relations should not be maintained with the current leadership since it has abandoned what it told its own people and the peoples of other countries.

We should be correctly understood in all countries with which we have relations. What we are doing is our business. We need perestroyka, but the forms and methods of its implementation are our responsibility and our domain. We stand by and recognize each people's sovereign right to choose its own social system, and we proceed on the basis that we have that right ourselves. Attempts to pose as mentor for the Soviet Union—a great state which has done and is doing so much for our civilization—are unacceptable. If some thought we would collapse or change our choice—that is their problem. I must disappoint them: We will do what we have to do. This should also be said to those who, on their travels abroad, have lost their sense of responsibility and patriotism and execrate everything connected with our country's hard times.

We will remain true to our choice and to the new thinking. It is necessary, because it responds to the fundamental interests of people who have become weary of the arms race and of tension. I would like to hope that this will also answer the question that is sometimes asked about whether the country's defense capability has been weakened. No, Comrades. Our defense capability has not suffered, but huge resources have been released and will be used in people's interests. We should not see other peoples as our enemies. We must deprive the forces linked with the military-industrial complex of any opportunity to speculate on their previous approaches, when the Soviet Union allowed itself to be dragged into the arms race and the cold war. We will continue our peaceful policy, which is in line with the fundamental interests of all the peoples.

M.S. Gorbachev answered questions from those present and wished them success in their work.

'Major' Moldovan Demonstration Backs Leadership

LD0503113191 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1045 GMT 5 Mar 91

[Text] Kishinev, 5 Mar (TASS)—MOLDOVA-PRESS reports that a major demonstration supporting the Republic of Moldova's president and prime minister took place today at the soviet socialist republic's Supreme Soviet building, in Kishinev.

As was already reported, since the crisis arose—caused by a group of agrarian deputies, Communists, SOVETSKAYA MOLDOVA, and independents striving to bring about Prime Minister Mircha Druk's resignation—the Supreme Soviet should have continued its plenary session today. But deputies since this morning have gone into clubs, where the issue of violations permitted by the government in export-import operations is again being discussed.

Demonstrators carried slogans protesting the 17 March all-Union referendum, among other slogans.

Ukrainian Communist Party Favors Renewed Union

91UN0929A Kiev PRAVDA UKRAINY in Russian 5 Feb 91 pp 1, 2

[Statement of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee: "For a Sovereign Socialist Ukraine Within a Renewed Union"]

[Text] In the course of a nationwide referendum on 17 March we will all have to answer the question: Union of Soviet Socialist Republics: to be or not to be? The country has never before faced a choice of such historic significance. It is a question of the future of a great state and the preservation of its integrity and the community of peoples, the direction of our further movement, and the fate of each individual.

The Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee believes it necessary to set forth its vision of this problem and the paths for its solution.

Our position is precise and consistent—we are for a renewed Union. Without the conclusion of a new Union treaty and the preservation of the multinational Soviet state stabilization of the political and economic situation, assurance of civil peace, and emergence from the dangerous impasse at which both the country as a whole and our republic have found themselves are impossible. Only by the joint efforts of sovereign republics in a renewed union can a firm foundation be laid for the accomplishment of all our plans, hopes and aspirations.

The idea of renewal of the Union is dictated not by opportunist political considerations or ambitions and it did not come to be recognized just the other day. The entire logic of the development of our society and the surmounting of the deformations of socialism allowed to occur in the past have led to this idea.

Today we are experiencing a profound and dangerous crisis which has encompassed all aspects of life. It is being intensified by a lack of mutual understanding and dissension in various spheres and at various levels: between the legislature and executive, Union and republic laws, central, republic and local organs of administration and so forth. Each day brings increasingly new proof of the fact that an inability or reluctance to seek mutually acceptable compromise and create a basis for consolidation, and the deliberate further acceleration of destructive processes, are the direct road to chaos and the line beyond which the situation becomes unpredictable and unmanageable.

We need to clearly see the danger of the unfortunately not unsuccessful attempts to impart to all of today's difficulties and contradictions a national tinge. It is this which is now the main weapon of separatist forces which are attempting to loosen the friendship of the peoples, tempered over decades and inherited by us, as a principal barrier in the way of their arrogant goals. The conflicts in interethnic soil, which they have inspired and which in a number of regions of the country have already developed into bloodshed, are the logical consequence of such a cynical and insidious policy. And at the same time a warning signal for all of us and a graphic caution about what awaits the country and its peoples in the event the poisonous, turbid wave of national chauvinism is not stopped.

Struggling for preservation of the Union by no means signifies clinging to what is old, as their political opponents ascribe to the communists. No republic any longer wants a union like the one which took shape in Stalin's times, with unitary distortions. We can no longer be reconciled with the departmental diktat of the center and the disregard for the important interests of different regions.

All this is quite so, but in addition to these realities there is the dialectic of history and the logic of reality. We need to take account of the fact that for centuries our country has taken shape, lived, and developed as a multinational integral state, and this is what we have inherited also. And despite everything appalling and brutal which occurred in the past—and it has to be said for fairness' sake that not one state has escaped one dark page of history or another—our Motherland has endured all the tribulations and upheavals which have befallen it. And not simply endured and not simply preserved its statehood but remained the common home for many peoples. On the scales of history this fraternal unity, whoever may deny it and deride it even today, outweighs both the expansion of tsarism and social and national oppression. And however abrupt and willful the vicissitudes of history have been, it is this unity which has helped many peoples survive and stand up to foreign invasions. In the many years of joint life they have become bound by thousands of threads of historical, economic, cultural, and family ties.

Having enshrined all that was good and valuable in these relations, the October Revolution opened a real path toward statehood for dozens of nations and national groups, the Ukrainian people included. We emphatically reject as a malicious fabrication today's attempts to ascribe to our party great-power, chauvinist views and aspirations. The truth is that it was the Bolsheviks headed by V.I. Lenin who, following the February 1917 revolution, were the sole party which in a polemic with its political opponents firmly and consistently upheld the principle of self-determination for all nations.

An unprejudiced glance into the Ukraine's past makes it possible to distinguish clearly who understood its independence and how this understanding was realized in practice. The Ukrainian people's aspiration to self-determination and the reunification of their land was the small change in the hands of bourgeois political intriguers throughout the Civil War. Does not the betrayal of national interests by Petlyura, in his insidious conspiracy with the Polish dictator Pilsudski, testify to this? In order to hold on to power, the "chief ataman" was prepared to give up a considerable part of primordial Ukrainian land to be lacerated by foreign occupying forces.

Those who are incessantly going on about the forcible nature of the formation of the Union of SSR [Soviet Socialist Republics] and who are interpreting the new Union treaty in no way other than as a "yoke on the neck of the Ukrainian people" are deliberately and painstakingly glossing over the facts which were the sources of this historical unity. It was the Soviet Ukraine, bleeding profusely and squeezed in the vise of counterrevolution, which advocated in May 1919 the creation in conjunction with the other Soviet republics of a "common front of revolutionary struggle."

And a month later the Ukraine, Russia, Latvia, and Belorussia joined efforts in opposition to the foreign intervention and internal counterrevolution. It was this military and political alliance which secured victory for the insurgent people in the Civil War.

The Ukraine was a sponsor of the formation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and took an active and direct part in this historic act. This was the sole path of salvation from imperialist enslavement and national oppression.

Many enthusiasts for speaking spitefully on the "imperial" theme and subjecting our past to a total revision have emerged today. This, specifically, is what is being said by certain "representatives of democratic parties and public organizations of the Ukraine": "The state known as the USSR—the Soviet Union—was not a voluntary union of sovereign republics but a forcible unification of the territories and peoples of the former Russian Empire and its successor."

But how, then, can they explain, if only the following: Why did this "forcible unification" not fall apart at the first serious test? And it not only preserved its unity and cohesion but emerged victorious in the battle against fascism, to which far wealthier and more developed states had capitulated. It is particularly appropriate to recall this now, in the year of the 50th anniversary of the perfidious attack on the Soviet Union by Hitler's Germany. And simultaneously also the fact that the aggressors were diligently assisted by the OUN [Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists] people, whom the latter-day "democrats" are attempting to portray as fighters for the freedom, independence, and statehood of the Ukraine, lauding to the skies today Bandera and other accursed enemies of the Ukrainian people.

Nor can anyone deny the fact that it was in the Soviet Union that the unification of all Ukrainian land in a single state became possible.

Life testifies that the Union is not an artificial formation, not a chance zigzag of history, but the objective result of the development of a multinational society. And the way to social progress lies precisely through the improvement of this unique formation with regard for the latest processes and trends. We should understand all together and each individually that **any choice other than that based on the principles of the renewed voluntary union of sovereign republics leads to impasse and a remote corner without a future and without prospects.**

And this choice needs to be made consciously, reflectively, and responsibly.

A multitude of factors speaks in support of such renewed unity. The consequences of ignoring them are no longer, unfortunately, just theoretical conjecture. Thus attempts at economic exclusiveness in the guise of economic sovereignty are leading to a painful severance of business ties which have taken shape over decades. Some people may have derived certain benefits from these dubious experiments, but it is becoming increasingly clear that they are fleeting and are resulting even today in enormous losses.

It is significant that the opponents of the Union treaty both in the Ukraine and in other republics are resorting to identical arguments in the economic sphere. Exacerbating national feelings and developing centrifugal forces and frequently executing the commissions of overseas "sponsors," they are endeavoring to portray matters such that some people are robbing the nations and prospering at their expense. But however subtle the manipulation of tendentiously selected statistical data taken out of the overall economic context, they cannot hide the fact that it is unity, mutual support, and interaction which have helped our peoples at all stages of their development.

Was not the restoration of the economy after the war internationalism in action and a manifestation of our friendship? We had no Marshall Plan and could count only on ourselves in overcoming the losses, which in today's prices would be even more than 1 trillion rubles [R]. With the help of the entire state the Ukraine quickly healed its wounds, raised up its cities and villages from the ruins in four or five years and restored the economy and in a number of indicators surpassed the prewar level even then.

As far as Lvov, Ivano-Frankovsk, and Ternopol Oblasts are concerned, where speculation around economic problems has become particularly active currently, we could present the following data. Over R47 billion in capital investments has been spent on developing the production and social base of these oblasts since the war, and their growth rate in the last 30 years has been 1.4 times higher than in other oblasts. Industrial production in the Lvov area has increased by a factor of 90, compared with the 1940 level, and by a factor of 45 in Ivano-Frankovsk and Ternopol Oblasts, which is more than in the republic as a whole by factors of 4.5 and 2.2 respectively.

The economic necessity of preserving the Union on a renewed basis is increasing even more as a consequence of the transition to market relations. This is a big, complex test, which may only be passed given a single economic space and with the aid of the country's entire common potential—production, intellectual, spiritual. After all, the intensification of the process of the integration and social division of labor is a characteristic sign of our times and is typical of all developed countries. The republics cannot survive in isolation, and we cannot allow an understanding of this to come to us too late and at too high and bitter a price. Even now, at the approaches to the market, the trends toward self-isolation being stoked in certain regions are inflicting telling blows on all the Union republics without exception and on the well-being of their populations.

We also need a renewed union to ensure that people may live and work normally, without fear for their future and their near ones and dear ones. Reality shows that tension in social, national, and religious soil is rising sharply and becoming critical where certain forces are beginning to force a splittist, separatist mood, where an impertinent and irresponsible "war of laws" is unfolding, and where various pretexts for people's separation and their counterposing on any grounds are being sought and created. We are already witnessing the baneful processes caused by this, specifically, an increase in the stream of refugees. All this is causing immense economic damage and resulting in the death of people and hundreds of thousands of crippled destinies. And this when the anticonstitutional, unchecked actions of the "champions of liberty and democracy" are still limited in nature. But what might happen subsequently unless the escalation of lawlessness is halted?

We need to constantly remember the unique character of our Union state. Some 60 million persons, or more than one-fifth of its population, now live outside of their national-state formations. Proceeding from the sorry experience of the attitude toward representatives of nonindigenous nationalities on the part of the "democratic" authorities and their leaders in certain republics, there can be no doubt that if these republics seceded from the USSR a situation of tremendous explosive force would be created. Almost 7 million Ukrainians, incidentally, live in other republics. And we should not be indifferent to the fate of our fellow countrymen not only in Canada or Australia but also in the Baltic, say. Or, in the same way, to the 14 million-plus non-Ukrainians who live and work in our republic. It should be added also that more than half of the population of the Ukraine works or studies in multinational outfits, and more than one-fourth has contracted mixed marriages.

Pursuing a policy of secession from the USSR would mean cutting to the quick, plowing over human destinies, and severing family and other relations. What serious, responsible politician would venture to embark on this and define the criteria and degree of mutual sympathies and antipathies without running the risk of a slide into racist and national-fascist positions? A rhetorical question, seemingly, but there are, apparently, those desirous of acquiring such dubious fame, for all that.

We may be proud that the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic has not adopted a single law or other document infringing in any respect on the rights and interests of the representatives of other nationalities. This is to the great credit of the deputies who are a part of the parliamentary majority—they operate consistently from internationalist positions. At the same time, however, it has to be seen that the high-sounding declarations of the forces in opposition to the Communist Party conceal quite different aims and practical actions. Many of the mass meetings and other activities staged on their initiative have a significant national-chauvinist focus.

It is a question of increasing tension on any pretext, destabilizing the situation, and ultimately tearing the Ukraine away from the Union of SSR and converting it into a bourgeois totalitarian republic. Resorting to irresponsible populist slogans about our own Army, currency, customs service, and so forth, the leaders of opposition parties and groupings do not see—more precisely, in the race for their opportunist political goals do not want to see—that the realization of these ideas would economically and politically roll the people back many decades and make the Ukraine a third-rate pseudo-independent state in the European backwoods. The secession of the Ukraine from the Union of SSR would create a real threat to its territorial integrity. After all, even now certain circles in neighboring republics and countries are making territorial claims on it.

The disintegration of the Union would fundamentally destabilize the international situation and undermine the system of international treaties and interaction in all spheres created by great efforts. There could also come to be beneath the fragments of our common home, so long and arduous in creation, those who are today persistently and unceremoniously loosening its foundations. Not to mention the collapse of the peoples' hopes for peace without confrontation, violence, and wars. And no one, not even the USSR's biggest foreign enemies, has an interest in such a finale.

All this leads to the principal thought under these conditions: **It is necessary not to destroy what has already been created but, using all the best from past experience, to renew the Union on the principles of free choice, general harmony, and equal cooperation. The legal foundation of this union should be a new voluntary treaty.**

The Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee believes that the draft proposed by the president of the USSR, but with appreciable additional work and extension, could be made the basis for this.

It is essential primarily, before the signing of the new treaty even, to clearly delineate the authority of the Union and the republics. The Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet must decide precisely which functions it will delegate to the center. It is competent to assume responsibility for the final version of the Union treaty and the reflection in it of the interests of the Ukraine and their protection.

A renewed federation should fully correspond to the interests of its subjects and be a guarantor of the free development of all peoples of our multinational state and the rights and liberties of the citizens.

It is essential to minimize the center's interference in the affairs of the republics—both on matters of joint jurisdiction and on those which are transferred to the direct jurisdiction of the Union. As has been emphasized repeatedly, only the questions which the republics delegate to the Union themselves and, correspondingly, in respect of which they assume the financing of related expenditure may pertain to the jurisdiction of the former.

In our opinion, it is necessary to determine more precisely the form of state arrangement of the Union of SSR and its administration and powers, the concept of Union property and the correlation of federal and republic laws. The new Union treaty should undoubtedly provide also for the republics' right of unrestricted secession from the Union.

Great importance is attached to the procedure of the preparation, harmonization, and conclusion of the treaty. The Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee will, through the communist people's deputies, raise the question of the republic's proposals concerning this being collated by the USSR Supreme Soviet as soon as possible.

The Ukrainian Communist Party advocates the conclusion of a new Union treaty on terms equal for all subjects and is prepared to cooperate in its realization with all social and political organizations and healthy forces which in their policy and practical activity uphold the fundamental interests of the people of the Ukraine. At the same time, however, we will resolutely confront those who in their aspiration to create an enemy image in the shape of the Union are shunning no provocative methods, including dirty ones.

The population of the republic should know the true essence and price of such methods—from categorical and unconditional rejection of the mere idea of a new Union treaty through insidious "versions" of it which leave not even a hint of this idea. Specifically, such "latest" projects and plans which recognize merely horizontal relations between the republics, without a common center and Union state, and envisage the replacement of the Union by interstate formations and the termination of the USSR Constitution have emerged on the wave of critical sentiment regarding the Union treaty. There are leaders and propagandists who, not troubling themselves with needless arguments, are putting out the call: Since the communists are for the Union treaty, vote against it!

But the leadership of Rukh, the Ukrainian Republican Party, and other parties and groupings does not, as can be seen, rely overmuch on support for its ideas and views among the people and their desire to change for dubious separatist slogans the time-tested sense of a united family. It is for this reason that there has come to be increasing talk of boycotting the coming referendum.

We firmly believe that the communists, working people, and the entire people of the Ukraine have sufficient political and vital experience, civic responsibility, and common sense not to allow themselves to be deluded by political intriguers and demagogues.

We believe in the capacity of our people to make in the referendum the balanced, responsible, and sole correct choice of their path into the future.

The essence of this choice is a sovereign socialist Ukraine in a renewed Union!

Caucasus

Further on Disturbances in North, South Ossetia

Tskhinvali 'Increasingly Acute'

AU0403165591 Tbilisi Domestic Service in Russian 1530 GMT 4 Mar 91

[Text] The situation in the Tskhinvali and [name indistinct], formerly Znauri, rayons is becoming increasingly acute. From the evening of 3 March until the morning of 4 March, Ossetian extremists were firing on the Georgian villages of Tamarasheni and Otona. A great number of rockets were fired by them on the village of Otona. According to preliminary data, there are no casualties. The bandit attack was also made against the village of (?Bisheli) inhabited by both Georgians and Ossetians. In Tskhinvali itself, shooting could be heard in some places throughout the night. Three homes belonging to Georgians were burned down. It was relatively quiet on the morning of 4 March.

Casualties in South 'Skirmishes'

LD0403183791 Moscow Central Television Vostok Program and Orbita Networks in Russian 1530 GMT 4 Mar 91

[Report by correspondent A. Gugli from South Ossetia, from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] First, a report from South Ossetia, which, just like an open wound, constantly reminds one of itself. One of the main remedies is, of course, sufficiently full and objective information about what is happening in this rayon. Unfortunately, we do not yet have such remedies. We are only able to acquaint you with the viewpoints of our correspondents, who frequently are unable to report on everything.

[Gugli] South Ossetia is now undergoing a tough news blockade. Tskhinvali, the administrative center, has virtually no communication with three of the oblast's rayons: Khalgorskiy [as heard], Znaurskiy, and Tskhinvalskiy.

[P. Khozity, SOVETSKAYA OSETIYA correspondent] It is already more than a month since the teletype in the editorial office was cut off. No information whatsoever is coming in either from Moscow or from Tbilisi. As you can understand, the work of the editorial office is worthless without a teletype. Apart from this, the local radio has not been working. It is about to start operating but so far has not done so.

[Gugli] Virtually every night shots and volleys of automatic fire can be heard in the town and and only in the morning can one see the traces of these skirmishes, both new and old. It is extremely hard to find out what is going on in villages and settlements guarded by detachments of fighters, Georgian in some, Ossetian in others, because it is not safe to move around unaccompanied. This is why we have observed the situation from the air so frequently. On one occasion, however, the film crew managed to get to the settlement of Dzari in Tskhinvalskiy rayon. This lad was wounded near the settlement of Monasteri. He asserts that he came under fire from sub-machine guns. Witnessing this, his enraged friends decided immediately to take revenge. One can only guess at what is happening out there in the remote villages that are cut off from the center.

Neither the Georgian nor the Ossetian side as yet has accurate data on victims. When we interviewed Militia Major General (Kvantiliani), commandant of the town of Tskhinvali—and this was at a State Automobile Inspectorate post on the way into Tskhinvali—the number of persons killed on the Georgian side was nine, with the number of wounded and missing unknown. A few days later, however, the number of victims has already risen by six persons.

(Khugayev), the first deputy chairman of the oblast executive committee of South Ossetia, also gave approximate losses on the Ossetian side. There are more than 30 dead and more than 150 wounded. Neither side has precise information, nor has a representative of the temporary press center of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs situated in Tskhinvali. Today it is still very difficult to distinguish the truth from rumors. The lack of accurate and verified information on both sides makes it impossible to establish a full picture. But the main thing, the main thing now is to halt the confrontation, to get life back to normal, and to restore warmth and light to homes, smiles to people's faces, and past friendship to the two neighboring peoples.

[Announcer] Let me add, however, that it will be extremely difficult to do this.

TASS Reports South Unrest

LD0403201891 Moscow TASS in English 1915 GMT 4 Feb 91

[Text] Vladikavkaz March 4 TASS—Tskhinvali, the administrative centre of South Ossetia, is facing dramatic food shortage as road blocks keep it cut off fresh supplies of foodstuffs.

All roads leading to South Ossetian centre are controlled by Georgian militants, members of unlawful armed groups, TASS was told at the press centre of the extraordinary committee under the chairman of North Ossetian parliament.

The explosion of the pivotal bridge near the village of Kehvi was followed by other subversive acts aimed at cutting off the inflow of humanitarian aid to Tskhinvali from different regions of the country. Another bridge was blown up and the road cover was exploded near the village of Kemerti. An engineering unit of the USSR Interior Ministry's troops is now working around the clock to restore these installations.

The North Ossetian Interior Ministry has reported that last night intensive shooting was heard in and around Tskhinvali. Georgian militants machine-gunned residential areas in the city from a hideout near the automobile servicing station, wounding several civilians in Tskhinvali. Ossetians responded with gunfire.

The influx to North Ossetia of refugees fleeing South Ossetia has increased. According to official figures, they number over 12,000, including more than 6,000 children.

Tbilisi March 4 TASS—A spokesman for the Georgian Interior Ministry told SAKINFORM that the situation in the Tskhinvali and Znauri districts is growing increasingly tense. On Sunday night, Ossetians opened fire at two Georgian villages. Some missiles were fired at one of the villages. So far no casualties have been reported. The village of Disevi, inhabited by Georgians and Ossetian, was also attacked.

In Tskhinvali occasional shots were heard throughout the night and three houses belonging to Georgians were burnt.

Georgian CP Denies Links With Mkhedrioni

AU0403124191 Tbilisi TSKHOVREBA in Georgian 27 Feb 91 p 1 (Tentative)

[Statement by the press center of the Central Committee of the Independent Communist Party of Georgia; date of statement not given]

[Text] Recently, in the republican press, information has been spread alleging that the activities of the Mkhedrioni [illegal armed formation] are connected with the Georgian Communist Party [CP]. An official statement has been repeatedly released claiming that former leaders of the [Georgian] Communist Party are connected with a certain "revolutionary committee" that is operating outside the borders of the republic.

The press center of the Central Committee of the Independent Communist Party of Georgia is authorized to announce that this information is lacking all substance. Not only has the Georgian Communist Party not engaged in joint activities with the Mkhedrioni, but it has also not had any contacts with it in the past nor has it at present. The Georgian Communist Party has no information at all regarding the so-called "revolutionary committee."

The press center hopes that, in future, the mass media will base their information on reliable sources.

[Signed] The press center of the Central Committee of the Independent Communist Party of Georgia.

More Bombs Explode, Cause Damage in Stepanakert

Home Housing Soldiers Hit

LD0403135191 Moscow TASS in English 1343 GMT 4 Mar 91

[By correspondent Vadim Byrkin]

[Text] Stepanakert March 4 TASS—People in Stepanakert, the centre of Nagorno-Karabakh, were awakened by an explosion last night.

The explosion occurred at 04.00 in a private house, where five officers of the USSR Interior Ministry and the family of a serviceman are residing, TASS learned from the commandant's office of the special administration district for Nagorno-Karabakh and adjoining districts of Azerbajan.

The exlosive device was placed under the door. All the windows and doors in the house were shatterred, but nobody was hurt.

Damage to Dam Cuts Water Supply

NC0403223291 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 1730 GMT 2 Mar 91

[Text] The workers who, under the protection of the troops of the USSR Internal Affairs Ministry, were repairing the damage caused to the Stepanakert reservoir by a bomb on 26 February, had not yet finished the job when a new explosion yesterday hit the dam of the same reservoir, located near the Azerbaijani village of Gaibaliy. Once again, more than half of the population of Stepanakert and the servicemen found themselves without drinking water.

(?Arslanyan), chief of Stepanakert's water pipes and drainage office, told a TASS reporter that the repairmen and servicemen who arrived at the location were fired upon. Fortunately, no one was injured.

Stepanakert's residents have appealed to the military commandant of the state of emergency, demanding that the Gaibaliy reservoir be placed under military control, because although this is the 15th act of sabotage to be carried out here, none of the culprits has been identified or brought to justice.

The direct material damage from the sabotage is estimated at 200,000 rubles.

The construction of a new dam has already started. For the time being, repairmen are being protected by the servicemen. It is still not clear when the city's water supply will resume.

Armenia Adopts Law on Public, Political Groups

LD0403192891 Moscow TASS in English 1859 GMT 4 Mar 91

[Text] Moscow March 4 TASS—The Armenian parliament adopted a law on public and political organisations, IZVESTIYA reports today.

Under the law, all public and political organisations registered in Armenia will base their activities on equal prerequisites.

The law prohibits public and political organisations from receiving financial and material help from sources outside Armenia.

They cannot set organisational structures within state bodies, organisations, enterprises and educational institutions.

State bodies outside the republic can neither run these organisations nor be part of their structure.

If an organisation violates any of these prohibitions, the republican Ministry of Justice will have the right to suspend or ban its activities.

The adoption of the law was preceded by long and heated debates in the parliament.

Armenian Supreme Soviet's Decision on Referendums

NC0503012091 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 1730 GMT 1 Mar 91

[Report by correspondents Mavr Danielyan and Khrayr Chamchyan from the Armenian Republic's Supreme Soviet session on 1 March—recorded]

[Excerpts] [Correspondent] The issues on the session's agenda, issues around which political debate has revolved for the last two days, are of crucial importance to our republic.

At the evening session yesterday, the Republic Group of people's deputies proposed that representatives of the public and political organizations should express their views on the Union and republican referendums today, and only after this should a final decision be considered. A number of people's deputies had said yesterday that they would also like to hear the views of the chairman of the Council of Ministers.

Levon Ter-Petrosyan, chairman of the Supreme Soviet, who was chairing the morning session today, gave the podium to Prime Minister Vazgen Manukyan:

[Manukyan] Esteemed deputies and members of the presidium: This is the second time in this century that our people are undertaking a titanic and great movement. The first movement took place at the turn of the century and aimed at liberating western Armenia. Liberation did not mean the establishment of an independent state, which was a long-term dream. Those involved in the liberation struggle included not only the people of western Armenia, but also those of the section of eastern Armenian which had been enslaved inside the Russian empire. The idea of independence was seen as a factor in the struggle and not as a end in itself. We eventually lost western Armenia and 1.5 million lives. Toward the end of the century, in the year 1988, a similar movement emerged, with the same ideology and the same first steps. This too was accompanied by massacres reminiscent of those that took place at the turn of the century, differing only in the numbers involved, for now we had fewer compatriots (?in those regions) we wanted to liberate. The year had changed, but everything else stayed the same.

The question arose: Should we proceed along the same road toward the same results or should we learn something from the first movement? Fortunately, the second movement included people who had carefully analyzed the first movement and were aware of the conclusions drawn by our well-known theoreticians at the end of that movement. They injected new energy into the second movement, proceeding from the fundamental axiom of the national liberation movement. What is that axiom? This has been said many times, but let me repeat it once again: If a people lack independence, their sole national objective should be to attain independence. All other national issues are contingent on this and can only be solved if independent statehood exists. [passage omitted]

When we make decisions on economic matters, we are in effect dependent on this empire. We are not autonomous. At present Armenia has no possibility of implementing any sort of autonomous economic program. We might draw up excellent programs, but they cannot be implemented. Therefore, a decision must be made: Either we remain within the structure of the Soviet Union in one form or another, in which case complex economic problems ensue, or we leave the Union, in which case economic problems also arise as regards what should be done next. What then is my stance on this? I cannot predict what political ploys may still be tried in the Soviet Union or what forces might replace the present center, but I am sure of one thing: This empire will continue its economic decline for decades to come. To attach ourselves to that economy makes no sense at all. We must attach ourselves to foreign countries, to the economies of foreign countries. Our lack of independence has imposed economic limitations on us and these limitations will never be circumvented unless we are an independent state.

Another question then arises: If we are independent, what will happen to the Artsakh [Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast] problem? Well, what is happening now, when we are in the Soviet Union? What levers are we able to use? Although, naturally, one may argue that this or that thing could have been done but was neglected, basically, as long as we remain within the Soviet Union, we will be unable to solve the Artsakh problem; we cannot ensure the security and autonomy of our compatriots in that part of the (?prison). I am, therefore, resolutely in favor of obtaining independence. This raises the question of what steps should be taken to achieve that independence. I reiterate what my colleagues have already said: A referendum must be declared.

When should this referendum be held and what will happen after it? We could examine all the possibilities, but I would prefer not to engage in a detailed analysis of the various options. What is certain is that the referendum will have three important aspects. First of all, it will involve international public opinion, winning over other countries to our independence. Second, we will have an appropriate and clear program vis-a-vis the center. Third, we will be able to rally our people who favor independence. During yesterday's meeting of the Republic Group it was stated rightly: Declare independence, have all the parties and the entire people unite around independence, and you will see that the people will take to that road with joy, singing and smiling. Of course, enormous difficulties lie ahead. We must not fool ourselves. The first years will be very difficult. But independence is the only road to prosperity and the only way to extricate ourselves from the abyss.

Therefore, I propose that a referendum be held (?after) six months to establish the legal basis for talks with the center and other countries. But this question should be put to a vote before this—perhaps in a month or so—and this vote should have the force of a referendum. That will enable us to go forward. [passage omitted]

[Correspondent] The chairman then put the following question to a vote: Who is in favor of not holding a Union referendum in the republic? The legislature heard the results of the vote with applause: 182 in favor, none against, and one abstention. Thus, we repeat, it was decided not to hold a Union referendum in the republic.

Next, the legislature took up the issue of holding a republican referendum. The following spoke on the issue: People's Deputy Arkadiy Sargisyan from the Communist faction; Davit Vardanyan from the Republic Group of people's deputies; People's Deputy Paruyr Ayrikyan from the National Self-Determination Association; People's Deputy Valeriy Mirzoyan from the Nationalist Group of people's deputies; People's Deputy Ashot Voskanyan from the minority faction in the Republic Group; People's Deputy Azat Arshakyan from the Christian Democtaric Party; People's Deputy Ashot Navasardyan from the Republican Party; and People's Deputy Vano Siradegyan from the Armenian Pannational Movement.

With 182 votes in favor and two against, it was decided to hold an Armenian Republic referendum. [passage omitted]

Thus the legislature decided to hold a republican referendum. The date now had to be decided. Various factions and groups put forward different dates. [passage omitted] Finally, with the required majority of votes it was decided to hold a Republic of Armenia referendum after six months. It was also decided to hold the republican referendum on Saturday, 21 September 1991. The Supreme Soviet Presidium was empowered to change the date of the referendum if so warranted, provided that the new date is not later than the first date.

Dear listeners, we now bring you the concluding statement of Levon Ter-Petrosyan, chairman of the Supreme Soviet:

[Ter-Petrosyan] We witnessed three very busy weeks this session. The first was when the chairman of the Supreme Soviet was elected and the second was when independence was declared. The third was the one which we just experienced. In comparing these weeks, we see that all focused on the same political issues, but to my mind, from the point of view of political maturity, the third week should be considered the most outstanding, because it was in this week that a multi-party spirit was displayed in our legislature for the first time. We experienced for the first time that our legislature is becoming a genuinely multi-party one. To our surprise, it transpires that the multi-party system brings unity, not division. This was a real surprise for us. Our legislature was never as united as it was once the political currents were demarcated and the factions delineated; only then did it become evident that these groups were motivated not by group and party interests, but by pannational interests. Therefore, it is the supremacy of the multiparty system and the transcendence of pannational interests over partisan ones that create a new (?harmony) that ensures the proper functioning of any legislature for the well-being of its people. There is no alternative. We can congratulate ourselves, not to say marvel at ourselves, that we are on the right course. [passage omitted]

This concludes my account of this week's work, but I would also like to describe in general the work we did over the past seven months.

The first session of the first convocation of the Armenian Republic's Supreme Soviet began on 20 July 1990 and is now ending, seven months and nine days later. During this time, 101 full sessions took place lasting a total of almost 650 hours. We now have permanently functioning higher organs of [word indistinct]. So far 242 people's deputies have been elected to the Armenian Republic's Supreme Soviet which has 16 standing commissions and one special commission enlisting 120 people's deputies. The Supreme Soviet has appointed the chairman of the Armenian Republic's Council of Ministers and has partially confirmed the structure of the government. It has elected a constitutional commission, the members of the Supreme Court and its chairman, and the Armenian Republic's procurator general. During this time, it adopted the declaration on Armenia's independence, 244 decisions, 21 laws, and 10 declarations [word indistinct]. [passage omitted]

Central Asia

Kazakh President Nazarbayev Interviewed on Unity

LD0303000191

[Editorial Report] Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian at 1215 GMT on 2 March carries a 90-minute live edition of the "Political Dialogue: Who's Who" program with Kazakh President Nursultan Nazarbayev answering viewers questions posed by Igor Fesunenko.

Fesunenko begins: "I would like to say that this program is being broadcast live not only to the European part of our country, as is the usual case; it is being broadcast live in Kazakhstan—your land, Nursultan Abishevich—to Central Asia, to all the time zones."

Fesunenko says the program has received hundreds of questions and messages for Nazarbayev, who stands very high in public estimation. After reading out several messages of praise, Fesunenko moves on to the questions:

"Now, I think that the television viewers will not understand us—no one will understand us—if right at the start of our broadcast we do not turn to the most important theme now of concern to many citizens of our country—all the more so since, although we have just started work, letters and questions are already coming in. I am referring to the coming referendum about the fate of our Union.

"Well, there are a lot of questions, and they are quite distinguishable. In short, you have got the point of the questions, what is your attitude toward the referendum?

"[Nazarbayev] There are other questions there, too. Up until the Fourth Congress of People's Deputies, the republic—and that included me—considered that there was no need for our republic to hold this referendum since the whole population would come out in favor of preserving the Union. In the declaration of the sovereignty of Kazakhstan that we adopted, it was clearly formulated that Kazakhstan and its multinational population is in favor of preserving the unity of our state, in favor of the Union, of the state. I agree with the sociologist whom you quoted at the beginning, that the formulation of the referendum is in itself very cumbersome.

"[Fesunenko] You mean the Union referendum?

"[Nazarbayev] Yes. So, at the suggestion of the people's deputies of Kazakhstan, when we discussed it...by The decision of the Fourth Congress the referendum is being held by republics—although it's a Union one, it is being held by republics, and so in all the republics the Supreme Soviets discussed the question and made decisions. So our formulation goes like this: Do you consider the preservation of the USSR as a renewed Union of [words indistinct] on referendum will be held in the republic, although we objected; and I still think that it should probably have been held in those republics where there are problems and questions in order to discover their opinions. (?we didn't have all this.)

"But so as not to declare a war of laws, as the comrade from Moscow said—I am anyway against this in principle—we shall hold the Union referendum on the 17th.

"As for the question on the supremacy of republican or Union laws, we don't put the question like that in the republic. The question is put like this: Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev had the idea of the name of the Union of Sovereign States. It was taken up by declarations in the republics, this formulation, and adopted in the declarations passed by the supreme soviets of the republics.

"Here we have this question. If it is like that, then the Union, the Union center, is formed from below, by the republics themselves, and its powers are defined—it has been said many times that the republics will voluntarily delegate their powers—these powers will have to be defined for the center, and what remains for the republics. So within the bounds of the powers given to the center, that's to say, to Union administration, the Union laws should be supreme. For everything remaining in the republics, according to the Union treaty, the supremacy is with the laws of the Union republics. There should be a proviso in the Union treaty about what this means, so that there should be a well-defined, clear position.

"[Fesunenko] A note has just come as if to comment on your answer. Comrade Kalinina from Moscow has just dictated it: Very many thanks to Comrade Nazarbayev for standing for us, for our Union.

"And Comrade Pyatchenko from Moscow: Is it true that the draft Union treaty provides only for Union citizenship, and that the republics will thus only have the chance, when registration is changed, to regulate immigration, people's arrivals, and so forth?

"[Nazarbayev] On the Union treaty, since the question has been asked, I'll talk about it straightaway. Right now, literally today, the leader of our delegation—all the republics are currently sitting around the table discussing the draft Union treaty—told me that nine republics had given a stamp of approval [zavizorovali] to the draft after expressing arguments, comparing opinions, and making their remarks. I heard this with such joy, and I inform our viewers of it.

"[Fesunenko] Your republic gave it a stamp of approval?

"[Nazarbayev] Yes, it did. Nine republics.

"[Fesunenko] Right.

"[Nazarbayev] These nine republics took part from the very beginning. (?Some) thorny questions or alternatives remained; they need to be worked on and clarified.

"The Union treaty. If one is to talk about that, what are the main factors keeping friendship between the republics and peoples and states? There have always been three of them. They are united by external military threat; second, by a common ideology; and third by a mutually advantageous economy. That's how it is, roughly. After all, these treaties have to be put together on some sort of basis.

"So today, the simple Soviet person doesn't see any threat hanging over us from outside—although globally it remains in prospect, and we need to think about that constantly.

"[Fesunenko] In theory, purely in theory.

"[Nazarbayev] Yes. As for the single ideology on which we used to be based, let's say frankly that today there is no such unity of ideology. If we are to speak of communist ideology, I consider that communist ideology, at the current stage of the development of our society, is not to be seen. So this principle, or basis, for a generalized experience is also receding into the background, let's say. So what remains? What remains is the economy.

"[Fesunenko] Which is also now...

"[Nazarbayev, interupting] It affects everyone. We have to start with the economy. But to speak frankly, how are we now proceeding in the Union, into the Union? If we have agreed that we need to adopt the Union treaty and sign it, and determine the powers, determine its property, and then start putting together the Union leadership—that's to say (?among) the functions to be determined by the republics the Union should have figured. Unfortunately, something else is happening today. I know the opinion of the other republics, the large republics, with whom we maintain contacts. As the whole country now knows, that discussion of the law on the government has started. I am simply amazed that this is happening before this question is discussed at the Federation Council. I know that the RSFSR, the Ukraine, Belorussia, Kazakhstan, and Uzbekistan said the law on the government should be discussed in the Supreme Soviet after it had been discussed at the Federation Council and certain opinions expressed there. But without discussing with us, and without taking our questions into account, it is nevertheless being discussed.

"Now look: In the first point it says that any decisions and instructions of the USSR Government are binding throughout the territory, for all officials; the president for the whole of the territory, for all officials; the Congress of People's Deputies for everyone, for all officials; the Supreme Soviet for everyone; and now the government also for everyone, and for all officials.

"What does this mean, at this time?"

"[Fesunenko] Aren't there too many leaders, you mean?

"[Nazarbayev] I can't understand it. I am in favor of there being a strong executive power, because I know what that means; without that it will be hard for us to put order into the economy.

"But again, if we are talking about the Union, about a union of sovereign states and republics, we must solve these questions together. Therefore, we in Kazakhstan are for the Union. But this must be a Union which acts in the interests of all our country's peoples and—since the peoples live in the republics—all the republics. I stick by my position. I do not consider that everybody should be roped into the Union if they do not wish to be part of it.

"[Fesunenko] Incidentally—excuse me for interrupting—there have been very many questions—I won't read them out now—about Lithuania and your attitude toward the wish of the Baltic republics to leave the Union, and so on.

"[Nazarbayev] The wishes of the peoples and the decisions of the supreme organs of power in those republics must be respected—especially as forcing these republics into the Union, whether they like it or not, will do no good. Those nine republics which have already made up their minds on this question should sign the Union treaty, define their positions, define functions, and set up a center. Then there will be a state. This is what is expected, I believe, by the overwhelming majority of the Soviet people. By the way, this is also expected by Western businessmen, who at the moment do not know who they should do business with. There will be a state and a center. There will be demarcation of powers between the republics and the Union. I consider that there will be an economic space within the parameters to which the republics put their signature.

"We are leaving the doors open for all the other republics. Let them ponder their options. I think the peoples of these republics will quickly work out what the implications are. In isolation it will be impossible for the republics to extricate themselves quickly from this crisis. They can only do it together. Furthermore, views have hardened over the years—in our veins, so to speak. We sense, with our mother's milk we have learned that we are children of one immense motherland, of one immense country. There have been shortcomings; there have been distortions; there have been grievances. All this is understandable. The whole point of our perestroyka is to resolve all these problems. But allegiance to one great motherland has become our philosophy. I consider that it is impossible to deprive the individual Soviet citizen of this allegiance. Therefore, I favor, I consider that the Union treaty is the foundation of everything."

Fesunenko then asks Nazarbayev to comment on Deputy Alksnis' suggestion that the Supreme Soviet and Congress should dissolve themselves, and that Gorbachev and Yeltsin should resign and be replaced by a Committee for National Salvation.

Nazarbayev answers: "I know Deputy Alksnis from the Supreme Soviet. He constantly mentions my name—although we are not personally acquainted—in various connections. He talks about my conduct. However, my fundamental view is that so-called Salvation Committees are an absurd idea when constitutional, lawful governments exist in each republic and state.

"[Fesunenko] I completely agree with you.

"[Nazarbayev] If this is being organized, with certain structures, in the center, I think it is very bad. At the moment I do not envy that committee which was set up in Lithuania. I do not envy its situation. Therefore, I categorically disapprove of this proposal, because it is just another version of those proposals calling again for an attack on lawful state authorities, on the constitutionally elected, constitutional leader of our state. There cannot be any question whatsoever of my participating in any committee. This is absolutely incompatible with my world outlook.

"In this connection, Igor Sergeyevich, I would like to take advantage of this opportunity to make one point. I see that NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA and MOSKOVSKIY KOMSOMOLETS, unfortunately, are printing articles about me.

"[Fesunenko] You are absolutely right. Such articles have appeared.

"[Nazarbayev] We in Kazakhstan do not read these papers. When they print these articles, they do not consult me. If this were done with benevolent and sincere intent, so to speak, I would be grateful. But this can also be understood in a different light."

Fesunenko says a viewer has asked what took place between Nazarbayev and Yeltsin.

Nazarbayev replies: "Igor Sergeyvich, since the surname of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, president of the USSR, had been mentioned, I will avail myself of the opportunity and would like, through the screen, to congratulate him on his jubilee—on Mikhail Sergeyevich's 60th birthday.

"I already have had occasion to answer a specific question—also on Central Television—after the address by Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin. I want to state my positon, and very clearly, so that all that is clear and falls into place. Well, you know that Russia, Kazakhsta, the Ukraine, and Belorussia, the four republics, held talks on accelerating the creation, the signing of the Union treaty.

"In the first palce, an economic treaty exists between these four republics. Today, when all economic links have been ruptured, industrial enterprises have found themselves in very difficult conditions, and the conclusion of a treaty on supplies was complicated this year—the central government itself directed us toward developing horizontal links. We concluded an economic treaty, and we have a political declaration between these republics. Therefore, that part already has been worked out. These treaties have been ratified by the supreme soviets, and we are now operating and living according to these treaties.

"As far as our meetings are concerned, they pursued the most normal and noble aim for the country. Since such a development is under way—some want to preserve the Union, others want to pull it down—why shouldn't major republics and their peoples take up that noble mission and create the bones of the Union? I reiterate that we approached this along with Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin and Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev as heads of the republics which want to sign that treaty. That is a fact. All our meetings revolved around that. But when it is a question of preserving, so to speak, of winning or perhaps of winning back the declaration adopted by the Supreme Soviets of the republics on the sovereignty of the republics, we have to fight together. I shall say it directly, and I am not hiding the fact that, yes, we will stand up together against the dictate of the central departments, against the return to the past, or against elements of the administrative and command system again. Yes, we will resist.

"But we are all for the Union. We have the most noble aims. Therefore, in now joining another republic, other republics, I think that our talks which have begun have influenced the fact that there are nine of these republics today and we are heading toward that movement.... When the center began to carry out a policy and not to take account at all of our opinion, as is happening now, yes, we wanted to meet, for instance, in Minsk, to elaborate our policy. We did not hide that from the public, did not conceal the fact that our position on the Union treaty is such, and that we see the government of the Union as such. Well, that did happen.

"Before his [Yeltsin's] interview, before our meeting of the five republics...yes, on the 16th, before the interview on 16 February, we five republics met—Russia, the Ukraine, Belorussia, Uzbekistan, and Kazakhstan. (?We met on) the day a new Council of the Federation was held. Two questions were discussed at the Council of the Federation. The first was pricing. We must coordinate pricing; all of us agree with that. The second question was the law on the Cabinet of Ministers. We did not discuss the second question at all, because no one was prepared and, well, we are bothered by these clauses which I mentioned earlier. That must be discussed and examined.

"After that we decided to meet, first of all, to discuss the following questions: First, since five of us have signed economic agreements, how are they being implemented? Why are some republics being supplied by enterprises, by every enterprise, and other republics are not being supplied at all? What should be done to ensure that this treaty is alive and operational? We agreed to create a coordinating working committee, perhaps consisting of the chairmen of the State Committees for Material and Technical Supply in these republics which would monitor mutual economic relations and help our industrial enterprises to get in touch, to get started, and to receive what was agreed under the treaty.

"Second, we exchanged views on the Cabinet of Ministers, on the law. That is all. We agreed to provide information about this in the press, information which has been agreed on by everyone. This is what was done. Absolutely no other questions were discussed. Of course, we said that since we were speaking on behalf of everyone, this would have to be an agreed text or view, so that we did not shock each other with our pronouncements.

"As for Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin's speech, I would divide it into two parts. In the first part, he spoke about his dissatisfaction, about his criticism of the steps taken both by the new Cabinet of Ministers and the country's old leadership. When he spoke about the state of affairs in the country, about the stabiliztion of the country's economy, and, in general, the state of the country's economy, questions of order and discipline, I completely agreed with his criticism. I also agreed with the part in which Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin upheld Russia's sovereignty and the law which was adopted by the Russian legislature, and said that he would do his utmost—and maybe even more—to ensure that this sovereignty is given practicality. We agree on this. I wish to say openly that we will continue to share these positions, especially regarding the sovereignty of republics, so that this is given practicality.

"But I for one simply did not understand the last part of his declaration, about the president's resignation. I said this could not be supported in Kazakhstan. Why? Yes, indeed, viewers may recall, you no doubt recall my speech at the fourth Congress of People's Deputies.

"[Fesunenko] Of course.

"[Nazarbayev] I expressed very sharp criticism of the president, of the government, of the republic. But this criticism must be constructive, in the sense that we all want to improve life and the situation in the country that finds us entering a crisis and heading for inflation and very hard times. I simply could not regard calls at such a moment for the replacement of the constitutionally elected head of state by unconstitutional means and the transfer of his powers to some kind of bodies, as being constructive. I state this openly.

"I still do not understand what Boris Nikolayevich is proposing. He was not authorized to do this by the Federation Council or anyone else. This is the same sort of thing that Alksnis was proposing, a variation on that.

"[Fesunenko] Some kind of Committee for National Salvation.

"[Nazarbayev] This is unacceptable. Our people should understand this. Yes, there is dissatisfaction; yes, there are reproofs and criticism. We have expressed the opinion that the leadership is slow, that it does not take decisive measures. But when it started to take decisive measures to bring about order, let's say, what...[changes thought] Why should we object when there is patrolling to maintain order? Or the fight against organized crime? After all, we wanted this, and demanded it. We should be logical and consistent.

"I would say something else to finish this subject. If the country's economy deteriorates further, and we don't see it, and we don't see specific steps from the government, from the new cabinet—unfortunately, well, a huge country cannot live by extemporizing, one measure today and another measure tomorrow. People are asking us [about this]. Our people are patient, they know how to wait for the sake of the country, for the sake of everything. But we must say when and which steps we are going to take and when improvements will start, if only a rough outline, and by what means. Our government should say this. If it does not say it, then naturally there will be questions such as the ones the Supreme Soviet asked the president on 16-17 October.

"Now I think the question of whether our country's government should report back to the Congress of USSR People's Deputies and announce the steps it is going to take this year and next year will arise. What program it has come up with to stabilize the money supply? What issues we are going to tackle in the economy? How we are going to approach the market (?apart from) privatization and a system of compensation? These questions were raised by me two months ago at the congress, and we received no reply."

Fesunenko thanks Nazarbayev for his detailed answer to the previous question and turns the conversation to a discussion of the economy. He reads out questions related to the coupon system, foodstuffs shortages, and price increases.

"[Nazarbayev] Let us begin with the most topical issue which is worrying the entire country, not only the people of Kazakhstan. We do live in linked economies and we cannot be isolated from the departmental matters which are in progress throughout our country with relation to the provision of foodstuffs. Speaking specifically about Kazakhstan, people from Kustanay are saying that there has been a reduction in meat. I must turn to the figures. Figures are something which are inexorable, as they say.

"So, in 1985 Kazakhstan produced 1.15 million tonnes of meat. Last year we finished with the production of 1.65 million tonnes of meat. That is, an additional 500,000 tonnes were obtained, a growth of 27 percent. Such a thing has never before occurred. The number of sheep and goats owned by the private sector of the population in Kazakhstan has increased by almost 2 million, the number of cattle by almost 600,000. Let's look at the procurement of meat from the population: in 1985 40,000 tonnes were purchased for the year. This year we intend to purchase 130,000 or 140,000 tonnes.

"Milk in that time has increased by 16 percent. An average annual growth of 22 percent for grain crops has been obtained. Consumer goods grew 1.5 times; services increased twofold.

"It seems that for those times, if we cite these figures, everyone should have been given awards, and so on. I don't even want to talk about this, and don't speak of it anywhere, because on the one hand we see these figures, while on the other there are lines and empty shelves. This is a very terrible thing."

Nazarbayev goes on to give figures for Kazakhstan meat production, and explains that 22-25 percent of it, about 300,000 tonnes, goes to the all-Union stock.

"[Nazarbayev] We have to answer the question: What is going on? One can say that there used to be no refridgerators, and now every family has a refridgerator and tries to get a freezer, and of course to fill them. That's one thing.

"Second, a lack of confidence in the policy being conducted by our government leads to an over-stimulated demand. Rumors abound. Some apartments and dacha cellars are turned into veritable warehouses. That is, the man on the street—and we can understand him—acts according to the principle: Take it while it's there; there may not be any tomorrow. On this I want to give a figure: Last year the income of the Soviet population grew by more than 80 billion rubles at a time when, as we know, the economy fell by 4.3 percent. That is, the hot money which exists—and which, incidentally, we organized from above by our foolish, erroneous actions, abandoning all control over the circulation of money in the country, which was not up to the production of goods and demand from the people—this is what led to this result.

"Perhaps someone will say to me: Why are you saying that everyone has money? I'm not saying that everyone's money has increased by so much, but facts are facts, figures are figures. You can't get away from that."

Nazarbayev says Kazakhstan's export situation—meat, milk, groats, and flour—will improve slightly this year. Perestroyka is about making people's lives better. As for coupons, he says, Kazakhstan was the last to introduce them, and this because its food was being exported to republics which had them. He gives figures to support this. The idea is to allocate items fairly to people at state prices. The system is a temporary one. In certain circumstances, people are allowed to send parcels to relatives outside the republic.

"[Fesunenko] So, one can firmly suppose that coupons are a temporary phenomenon?

"[Nazarbayev] Of course."

Fesunenko suggest that coupons are a temporary measure, to which Nazarbayev agrees that, of course they are.

"[Nazarbayev] Actually, I would like to reply to the question put by that pensioner about pensions. I believe all of us realize that after the wholesale prices we will tackle retail prices, although as of 1 January, when we raised wholesale prices, we had to decide on retail prices, too. At the same time as the rise in retail prices, we have compensation for foodstuffs and goods in heavy demand. Here we are talking about raising the minimum pension level and lowering the top level of income of the population, which will be taxable [as heard]. In other words, this question will be resolved.

"Now, as for the Karaganda miners, I know that in Karaganda at the present time there is a strike at some mines. I have worked for some considerable time in Karaganda and Karaganda Oblast, and I do understand the economic demands of the miners who work on the most trying and dangerous sections, as well as the issues of social development, supplying the people, and accommodation and foodstuffs. I completely support all these demands, and have always been with us. [sentence as heard] Incidentally, the Government of Kazakhstan is doing all it can for the miners in these conditions. We are maintaining the level of consumption of staples at a slightly higher level than the republican average, yet still there is a shortage today. But when people start talking about raising wages by two or two-and-a-half times, then you start wondering. What about the foundry workers who operate in conditions just as difficult? What about the chemical workers? What about the ferrous and non-ferrous metal ore miners? Surely wages should be raised universally? Then, when I heard about this I visited Pavlov, the chairman of the Cabinet of Ministers yesterday, and I have had two conversations with Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev. I have spoken to Shchadov, the minister of the coal industry. The republic cannot find the money out of its own budget because our budget is subsidized to the tune of 6 billion. If these wages are to be raised in the republic, then we will have to stop paying teachers' and doctors' salaries altogether and stop giving pensions and grants. But who is going to understand us? On the other hand, it is now spring and we are coming upon the sowing campaign. Kazakhstan is what is commonly known as an agricultural region, a huge one at that. Some 76 percent of Kazakhstan's power industry works on coal. To what is this going to lead? It will result in the stoppage of power stations, a shortfall in metallurgical production. Coke will not reach the works of the Ukraine, which we supply. They will get into trouble. The agricultural workers will not get the metal they need. We will simply not be able to organize the sowing. We'll make a mess of it and in autumn we will reap not a harvest, but a shortage of meat, milk, and grain. That's all there is to it. In other words, they are now demanding an improvement in supplies, but at the same time, what are we doing? I believe in the wisdom of the miners and the mining families. This will work against us all, and against the miners first and foremost. As of today, neither the state, nor the republic, nor the Ministry of the Coal Industry has the money to pay for the time which they are not working. That is one point. The second is that, of course, I understand all this and support it. Of course Moscow, the Coal Ministry, and we ourselves will all tackle these matters. There is no doubt of that. We will tackle them. But when the miners raise political matters, well, I simply do not understand that. They may become toys in the hands of the politicians who are defending their own political ambitions, wherever that may bring them. In that case, the miners and the mining families must sort out who it is that is calling on them to do this. Again I know that miners like order and discipline. Their work is hard. So, how come the miners are against constitutional order and against discipline? Down with this. Down with that. Is that really what we need today? This will all be sorted out constitutionally if it has to be sorted out at all. For this reason, I call on the miners to show good sense, for this strike is a blow against all of us, and first and foremost against them."

Fesunenko reads out a letter complaining that the law on lease subcontracting is not being properly fulfilled. Nazarbayev says he is well known for insisting that all structures of authority must support the various kinds of property in agriculture.

"[Nazarbayev] I want to say just one word in finishing the subject of the economy. At the moment we are, of course, in a profound crisis, and very serious inflation (?awaits) us. I want to say that if each republic thinks and imagines that we all need to act separately, I think that is either politicking or ignorance of their own region. We have to get out of it together. Of course, we would like to know the concrete program on this subject from the USSR Cabinet of Ministers. Yes, we are in a difficult situation today, but there is a way out of this situation: stabilization of the currency and privatization." Nazarbayev continues to outline this idea further, insisting on privatization. But he notes the republics do not have economic power, finance, hard currency, and banks, which are all at the center.

Fesunenko then introduces a film segment shot in Alma-Ata in preparation for this interview.

Fesunenko then reads a letter from a woman in Penza, expressing enthusiasm for Nazarbayev and asking about saving the Aral Sea.

Nazarbayev says he often goes to see those who are involved in this question, and that the USSR Supreme Soviet has allocated 900 million rubles to it, with the Kazakhstan portion getting three times more than before. The money is primarily to improve people's living conditions, but it will not solve the question of filling the sea. He says that the problem is being treated as a global one, with foreign advice being sought. Nazarbayev recalls the plan to transfer the waters of Siberian rivers to the Syr-Darya and Amu-Darya for the rapidly increasing population there.

Fesunenko then raises the question of Semipalatinsk and when it will be closed. Nazarbayev says the Kazakhstan declaration of sovereignty says nuclear testing must be banned. The people have done their duty to the fatherland for more than forty years of testing. No one spoke of the possible consequences to people or their animals until recently. Nazarbayev says the USSR Government and the military departments should provide medical assistance to the people of the region. So far the military departments have refused.

Fesunenko then asks about interethnic relations, noting that Kazakhstan is relatively calm and stable. He reminds Nazarbayev of the mass exit of the Soviet Germans from Kazakhstan, of a certain clouding of relations between Russians and Kazakhs, and of a report of Russian refugees from Kazakhstan.

Nazarbayev says that 100 nationalities live in Kazakhstan. Nazarbayev puts interethnic discord down to the following: "It seems to me that natural links have been lost. A common, single ideology, so to speak, held sway over everyone, and now this ideology has been put on the back burner, some kind of vacuum has formed." Nazarbayev says normal economic relations must be built upon because countries with good trade relations have stability. He says: "Economic integration has reached 70 percent today. It is impossible therefore to live without one another and to get out of this chaos individually."

"[Nazarbayev] It seems to me that those who are responsible for creating order so that there is stability in the region—the country's leadership—lack will and ability.

"To resolve these issues and to stop this business—this would be supported by everyone. Now, as far as Kazakhstan is concerned, we are pursuing a firm policy. The declaration of our republic's state sovereignty clearly records that all the peoples and ethnic groups living in Kazakhstan are equal, regardless of ethnicity, language, beliefs, political affiliation, and so forth. This must not just be proclaimed, but put into effect, working in practice. Such a rigorous policy in the whole adoption of laws is correctly understood, I think, by our peoples.

"With regard to the Germans, frankly speaking it always pains me to take about this. I regret that people who are very clever and reliable in all respects are leaving Kazakhstan. I do not think they are offended by something in Kazakhstan. They themselves say that they are not offended by Kazakhstan. Last year approximately 70,000 people left us. Here I am now hearing, and in Alma-Ata we received major bankers from the FRG and they intend to assist and create small industrial enterprises so that this population settles here and works, and we are prepared to work in this regard.

"With regard to the relations of Russians and Kazakhs, so to speak, I am—in my actions and policy in practice—trying to do everything, and every one of our oblasts is trying to do everything so there is no discord. Regarding 700,000 refugees, this is some kind of real provocation. I cannot say anything else about it."

Fesunenko concludes the program by noting that on 30 March Defense Minister Dmitriy Yazov will be the guest of "Who's Who."